

Joanne Fisher

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 April 2026 13:57
To: Dean Manning
Cc: planninginfo; Joanne Fisher
Subject: Re: planning applications - DM/25/3020 - Courthouse Farm, Copthorne, RH10 3LA

[REDACTED]
Dear Ms Fisher

Your letter of the 26th March only references application DM/25/3021

For clarity all of my comments in the below e mail equally apply as objections to application DM/25-3020 which I see from the portal had the same additional info uploaded on the 8th April

Regards
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

On 14 Apr 2026, at 09:16, Dean Manning <dean.manning90@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Ms Fisher,
Here we go again I'm afraid !

I'd like to make the following objections and observations (again) about the planning application referenced above

My name is [REDACTED] and my address is Haynes Farm, Copthorne Common, RH10 3LE.

We continue with this charade of an application following an awful attempt at a public consultation , clearly jaundiced to read that locals had no issues with this development - I'm hoping you saw through this.

We've then had the dual planning applications that clearly weren't acceptable, and now with have a volume of additional information that really doesn't address any of the significant and hugely detrimental effects this application would have.

Given the erratic nature of the applications and attempt at public consultation, questions must be raised about the intentions of the developer as their option to buy runs down on Courthouse Farm.

1. Highways Safety Issues

cut and pasted from my previous objection, please see below comments on the detrimental effect on highway safety.

Aswell as the comments below I'd add that the WSCC highways Ghost Island feedback is no more than a desk top study. Traffic flows are already disrupted by the pedestrian crossing but at least gives cars a chance to slow down as they round the bend from

Borers Arms(point b below) - the traffic flow with this additional entrance would be severely disrupted and continue to cause a significant safety concern.

As referenced below the additional noise and disturbance would be severe to the community but ignored is the enormous disturbance and huge increase in safety concern that the construction traffic and infrastructure installation would have. This would be for a significant period of time (well over 2 year in my experience)

- a. The new road layout is really a junction and is close to the bend that is known locally as Borers Arms Road bend
- b. There is precedent in terms of road safety for both vehicles and pedestrians. The golf club installed a pedestrian crossing some years ago. There was much debate at the time and the original crossing was moved so that it sits centrally between the bend at Borers Arms end and the Newtown road end. This was because the original Newtown end crossing was considered to be too close to the bend. The junction into the new estate is significantly closer to the borers arms road bend which undermines the previous precedent introduced due to safety concerns
- c. By introducing another junction onto an already busy 50MPH A road there will undoubtedly be severe disruption to traffic as follows
 - i. Entering the estate will hold up east driving traffic behind but critically it will force west flowing traffic to brake unexpectedly having seen traffic late form a blind bend
 - ii. Exiting the estate will be even worse, turning left will slow traffic down from the west but dangerously, anyone turning right (particularly anyone pulling out half way !) will cause a severe danger to oncoming traffic.
 - iii. Main A roads like the A264 arenot designed nor is it capable of being amended to cater for this. Note, digging up the entire stretch from the Copthorne roundabout to the dukes head would be a ridiculous disturbance
- d. Accordingly, this junction would be a severe Noise and disturbance to the community.
- e. Equally, it would cause a huge increase in risk of road traffic accidents.

2. Flood – significantly increased disturbance - cut and pasted from previous objection
The FRADS report does not fully address “how” a pumped land drainage solution would work and how it would be implemented given the inaccuracies in their base assumptions and the existing conditions that exist within the surrounding properties of both Haynes Farm and White Gates Cottage.

Courthouse farm and all of the surrounding properties sit within low lying land on the south side of the A264. This is evidenced with regular flooding and surface water remaining throughout the wetter times of the year.

- a.

- b. The estate development would clearly displace the ground water table and further cause significant disturbance by causing further flooding of the surrounding areas
 - c. The removal of surface water from the estate would directly impact and cause further significant disturbance to the surrounding properties and the village itself given flood water passes through the village and has been known to flood the Newtown bridge area within the village
 - d. The A264 floods regularly currently at it's low point – clearly this would worsen with this estate.
 - e. The significant environmental impact that flooding causes is dealt with below

- 4. Utilities – intrusion into the countryside and significantly increased disturbance - cut and pasted from previous objection - there appears to be no viable plan added to the application but I'd reinforce my point regards item "e" below. Adding utilities is an enormous undertaking and would provide years of disruption to both the road and the existing properties south of the A264 . The utilities provision south side of the A264 is barely adequate for the existing residencies. Given the age of some of the properties utilities have been retrospectively installed just for the properties that exist
 - a.
 - b. Mains drainage from these properties is provided by drains installed privately by the residents
 - c. The electrical supply is not enough for the residencies to add car charging ports to each dwelling
 - d. The water pressure regularly drops
 - e. These are all resolvable but require significant works such as a new sub station, new mains drainage (back to digging up the whole of the A264) and water supply.
 - f. There is a huge environmental impact of installing full utilities to this estate whilst installing temporary facilities for the existing dwellings to ensure they remain connected to the respective utilities
 - g. This is clearly a severe disruption and this site is clearly ill suited for this sort of development. That or the developer is seeking to simply "rob" what's there.
 - h. From a utilities standpoint this site is unfeasible in terms of servicing the estate and being able to do so without significant disruption to all around

- 5. Environmental impact for decades - cut and pasted from previous objection - all points remain
 - a. The environmental impact is severe and will cause significant pollution, noise pollution, and disruption not just throughout the build out period but for years thereafter – basically the whole life cycle of this development
 - b. The life cycle carbon calculation must take into account the irrefutable constraints and challenges this site has. The

carbon impact can't seriously be considered to be acceptable for a site like this when there are other sites far better suited

- c. Noise and traffic pollution will be immense and cause health and safety risks to residents
- d. The bio diversity impact to the development and all surrounding areas will be catastrophic
- e. The lack of utilities and need for major upheaval to install and upgrade is an environmental disaster

6. General Commentary - cut and pasted form previous objection - all points remain

- a. A large estate of either proposed development is clearly not in keeping with the appearance of the area
- b. The overbearing impact will cause disturbance to more than just the surrounding residences and will do so for the entire life cycle of the development
- c. There will be an undoubted economic loss to the area as is the case when excessive traffic is allowed to build up notwithstanding the wholly unacceptable increase in danger caused directly by traffic congestion caused by this development.

Since the last set of applications it's come to my attention that this development would contravene the District Plan 12 which sets out that there should be no development on the south side of the A264.

Accordingly, any development on the south side of the A264 would have a detrimental effect on the appearance of the area and be an intrusion into the countryside - noted within your letter as a key point for objection.

Disappointingly, this application continues to be needed to be forcefully objected to. As above and as previously objected to - the issues with the application fail on every one of the headings noted with your letter stating what can be commented on.

As you can imagine, having to defend and object against such an awful development remains hugely stressful and I hope that common sense within your planning team prevails given the clear issues that remain

[REDACTED]

On 18 Dec 2025, at 13:18, Manning, Dean

[REDACTED]

Dear Ms Fisher

I'd like to make the following observations about both planning applications referenced above.

My name is [REDACTED] and my address is Haynes Farm, Copthorne Common, RH10 3LE.

The following are objections and observations to both proposed schemes.

1. Highways Safety Issues

- a. The new road layout is really a junction and is close to the bend that is known locally as Borers Arms Road bend
- b. There is precedent in terms of road safety for both vehicles and pedestrians. The golf club installed a pedestrian crossing some years ago. There was much debate at the time and the original crossing was moved so that it sits centrally between the bend at Borers Arms end and the Newtown road end. This was because the original Newtown end crossing was considered to be too close to the bend. The junction into the new estate is significantly closer to the borers arms road bend which undermines the previous precedent introduced due to safety concerns
- c. By introducing another junction onto an already busy 50MPH A road there will undoubtedly be severe disruption to traffic as follows
 - i. Entering the estate will hold up east driving traffic behind but critically it will force west flowing traffic to brake unexpectedly having seen traffic late form a blind bend
 - ii. Exiting the estate will be even worse, turning left will slow traffic down from the west but dangerously, anyone turning right (particularly anyone pulling out half way !) will cause a severe danger to oncoming traffic.
 - iii. Main A roads like the A264 arenot designed nor is it capable of being amended to cater for this. Note, digging up the entire stretch from the Copthorne roundabout to the dukes head would be a ridiculous disturbance
- d. Accordingly, this junction would be a severe Noise and disturbance to the community.
- e. Equally, it would cause a huge increase in risk of road traffic accidents.

2. Walking and safety issues

- a. The golf club pedestrian crossing isnot accessible from the estate without crossing private property thus negating the claim that the estate has safe pedestrian access to the village

3. Flood – significantly increased disturbance

- a. Courthouse farm and all of the surrounding properties sit within low lying land on the south side of the A264. This is

- evidenced with regular flooding and surface water remaining throughout the wetter times of the year.
 - b. The estate development would clearly displace the ground water table and further cause significant disturbance by causing further flooding of the surrounding areas
 - c. The removal of surface water from the estate would directly impact and cause further significant disturbance to the surrounding properties and the village itself given flood water passes through the village and has been known to flood the Newtown bridge area within the village
 - d. The A264 floods regularly currently at it's low point – clearly this would worsen with this estate.
 - e. The significant environmental impact that flooding causes is dealt with below
4. Utilities – intrusion into the countryside and significantly increased disturbance
- a. The utilities provision south side of the A264 is barely adequate for the existing residencies. Given the age of some of the properties utilities have been retrospectively installed just for the properties that exist
 - b. Mains drainage from these properties is provided by drains installed privately by the residents
 - c. The electrical supply is not enough for the residencies to add car charging ports to each dwelling
 - d. The water pressure regularly drops
 - e. These are all resolvable but require significant works such as a new sub station, new mains drainage (back to digging up the whole of the A264) and water supply.
 - f. There is a huge environmental impact of installing full utilities to this estate whilst installing temporary facilities for the existing dwellings to ensure they remain connected to the respective utilities
 - g. This is clearly a severe disruption and this site is clearly ill suited for this sort of development. That or the developer is seeking to simply “rob” what's there.
 - h. From a utilities standpoint this site is unfeasible in terms of servicing the estate and being able to do so without significant disruption to all around
5. Environmental impact for decades
- a. The environmental impact is severe and will cause significant pollution, noise pollution, and disruption not just throughout the build out period but for years thereafter – basically the whole life cycle of this development
 - b. The life cycle carbon calculation must take into account the irrefutable constraints and challenges this site has. The carbon impact can't seriously be considered to be acceptable for a site like this when there are other sites far better suited

- c. Noise and traffic pollution will be immense and cause health and safety risks to residents
- d. The bio diversity impact to the development and all surrounding areas will be catastrophic
- e. The lack of utilities and need for major upheaval to install and upgrade is an environmental disaster

6. General Commentary

- a. A large estate of either proposed development is clearly not in keeping with the appearance of the area
- b. The overbearing impact will cause disturbance to more than just the surrounding residences and will do so for the entire life cycle of the development
- c. There will be an undoubted economic loss to the area as is the case when excessive traffic is allowed to build up notwithstanding the wholly unacceptable increase in danger caused directly by traffic congestion caused by this development.

I would be happy to discuss any or all of the above if required.

Thanks 

