

Sarah Valentine

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 15 July 2025 15:59
To: planninginfo
Subject: Formal Objection to Application: DM/25/1434 = Planning Proposal DPH19: Land at Chesapeake and Meadow View, Reeds Lane, Sayers Common

[REDACTED]

To whomever it may concern,

I would like to put in my formal objection to the Application: DM/25/1434, Planning Proposal DPH19: Land at Chesapeake and Meadow View, Reeds Lane, Sayers Common for many reasons.

1. Quality of the design - Access, Infrastructure, and Amenity Impact

Access problems / safety issues and traffic: Access proposals for this site are fundamentally flawed. Entry via the Chesapeake property would conflict with existing watercourses, hedgerows, and West Sussex County Council's buffer policies, and is located on a narrow, curved section of Reeds Lane where on-street parking already narrows the road to a single lane. The lane is used extensively by through traffic, including HGVs, and is poorly surfaced, with recurring maintenance issues. The reports taken where it states that there was little traffic is quite frankly insulting to the actual use of this road. It is in constant use, and you only need to speak to one of the residents along here to realise how detrimental such heavy traffic already is.

With the Kings Business Park (which has an enormous amount of regular traffic alone each day), AV Trade, local thoroughfare traffic AND the development traffic from other sites in the village, the village has to already contend with a HUGE amount of traffic and congestion. I live directly onto Reeds Lane and am astonished by the speed, the volume and the total chaos that is already existing.

The alternative access route - via Meadow View - is even less viable. Meadow View is a private road, not adopted by the local authority, and therefore residents would need to give explicit permission for its use. That permission has neither been sought nor granted. Furthermore, parking on Meadow View is already insufficient for current residents, with regular overspill onto Reeds Lane. Adding 33 homes' worth of traffic and vehicles would escalate this problem to unacceptable levels.

Appearance of the area: Beyond practical access, the development would significantly harm the appearance and character of this semi-rural area. The land currently contributes to an open, green buffer between houses and surrounding countryside. A high-density housing estate would erode this, especially in the absence of any current evidence showing the development will be of high architectural or landscape quality.

Without firm and detailed design proposals, the scheme lacks accountability on quality and cohesion with the surrounding environment. Given that the proposal to the South is for 2000+ homes, it is unfathomable to current VILLAGE residents that their needs be completely overlooked. It would be prudent to delay any decisions on this estate until other decisions have been made as to not completely ruin the character of the area.

The proposal would also lead to a substantial increase in noise, light, and general disturbance for residents in Osborne Close, Meadow View, and along Reeds Lane. This quiet area is not suited to the level of activity that 33 new households would bring, especially with limited amenity space and narrow access routes.

2. Water Supply and Broader Contextual Concerns

South East Water has itself acknowledged the shortage of reliable water supply in this part of Sussex and yet again, we are under a hosepipe ban because South East Water themselves have said that demand is outstripping supply. The infrastructure is already under pressure from existing developments. Allocating more homes without a detailed, guaranteed plan to expand water capacity would risk long-term sustainability and service failure.

Furthermore, the land immediately south of the DPH19 site is under wider planning consideration for significant housing growth. Proceeding with this development in isolation would risk overdevelopment of the area, without consideration for how these sites interact. It is vital that the District Plan avoids a piecemeal approach that could result in cumulative harm. This development should be deferred until decisions on adjacent land are made, ensuring that strategic planning is coherent, coordinated, and does not overwhelm local infrastructure or character.

3. Flood Risk

This site has a well-documented history of flooding, particularly in the area in front of Chesapeake, where a natural spring once fed a pond—evident on historical Ordnance Survey maps. Though the pond has since been filled in and the spring diverted into a culverted watercourse, flooding continues to occur, both at the front of the site and in its southern section, where a network of drainage ditches forms part of a broader surface water management system.

The land abutting the public footpath serves a vital drainage function for surrounding agricultural fields and acts effectively as a seasonal floodplain, which one could see even just from going on a dog walk most of the winter. Disturbing this system - whether by rerouting the path or building adjacent to it - could lead to excess water backing up into nearby housing due to the area's poorly draining clay soil. We are already regularly flooded in Meadow View.

Despite this, the reports attached to this plan have given the site a flood risk rating of low which is demonstrably inaccurate. At the very least, this should be amended to reflect the site's historic and ongoing flood exposure. A failure to properly assess this risk before allocating the site could result in preventable long-term damage.

Conclusion

In summary, this development raises significant planning objections on multiple grounds:

- * Demonstrated and unresolved flood risk
- *
- * Inadequate and overstretched wastewater infrastructure
- * Poor and unsafe access arrangements, especially considering private road status
- * Negative impact on local character, design quality, and residential amenity
- * Lack of sufficient water supply capacity
- * Premature allocation in the context of wider development pressures

Until these issues are properly investigated, addressed, and resolved - with evidence and public consultation - the proposal to allocate site DPH19 should be refused.

Many thanks,



18 Meadow View, Sayers Common, BN6 9GB