

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 May 2025 16:43:58 UTC+01:00
To: "planninginfo" <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/24/2957

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 13/05/2025 4:43 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	The Prince Albert Copthorne Bank Copthorne Crawley West Sussex RH10 3QX
Proposal:	Sever existing land to retain existing public house use and area of pub garden and erect a convenience store and 4 no. apartments with associated works, including alterations to the existing vehicular access and car park (Amended plans and retail justification received 1 May 2025)
Case Officer:	Andrew Watt

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 26 Erica Way Copthorne Crawley

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I have watched this application develop and listened to my local community. I have shifted from a neutral position to one of objection based upon a thorough and full consideration of all the information now available including the sentiments of our local population, with particular concerns they hold about the continuing erosion of a true village environment and real risks that are likely

to threaten the feasibility of our Post Office (within the adjacent block and within a locally family owned "true" convenience store.) Also the continuance of the only remaining pub within the village, now that the pub in the Copthorne Hotel is no longer open to local residents, with the building being used as a refugee centre. See Copthorne's made NP for appropriate mentions re community importance of Pub and Post Office.

Please be aware that this application is potentially strategically important in that the benefits it might bring relating to shopping choice, are far outweighed by the cohesive losses it will bring to a location with a distinct identity, rather than a home for national brands seeking to find new markets.

Let us not be fooled, this application is not for a convenience store, please see the many on-line definitions of such, but it is in fact a small densely stocked supermarket and will bring, as evidenced in its nearest namesake (1.8 miles away only), visitors from outside the locale and all that might mean.

The footprint is constructed to avoid Sunday trading restrictions and the model opens 7am to 11pm. 7 days a week with 2500 product lines.

The nature of the build is garish, signage urbanised, build quality is low standard and totally out of keeping with the pub styling and the 2 post war modest mixed, above shop retail, buildings. In fact the proposal more than doubles all the retail space utilised by 3 existing convenience stores which subjective evidence over time suggests satisfies the existing needs of Copthorne perfectly well. I suggest the ROK report is selective and designed solely to squash the comments made by locals previously who actually know the market capacity far better, based upon their lengthy buying behaviours, rather than a desk top exercise. Indeed by using Statistica average basket spend in a true convenience store, and recognising that 36% of grocery purchases are now on line I can demonstrate that the capacity in Copthorne is already satisfied by the existing turnover quoted in this report as attributable to the existing stores.

The traffic report is superficial and the recommendations unrealistic. The sight line concerns are given insufficient weight and mitigation proposals re signage woefully impractical and unrealistic. Using the Statistica data and even not including, staff, deliveries, Click and Collect and internet parcel traffic as, Expresses are agents of all the major logistic companies, visits the site can expect on average a visitor every minute it is open. The movements will not be evenly spread! The main village bus stop is also at this point and typically where the special needs care home opposite boards its' wheelchair users. The suggestion that walking and cycling will compensate is quite frankly ridiculous. In my 30 plus years in Copthorne I have never seen a cycle used to visit our existing stores and I did a count this week and 75% of visitors to the post office convenience store were in cars, already creating parking dangers and blockages at the existing site! The car park is simply too small, and for the pub as well, can we please apply some common sense. The movements

on the unsighted corner junction are simply too heavy and dangerous. I am also not sure that "potentially" closing our last pub and post office and damaging 3 businesses owned and supporting one of our local families brings local economic benefits to anybody but a FTSE 100 company and a wealthy meat product supply company who are behind the application. Finally the loss of view issue for the close proximity neighbours on Brookhill Road still has not been mitigated. Losing the windows in the apartments is hardly a solution for the over development here, needed to create sales square footage to make the corporate model benchmark for consideration. Copthorne residents deserve better. Oh and if the pub is developed beyond booze only, and it has existing planning, there is obviously capacity for it to be a success as the applicant has sought to prove capacity on this point....I assume you have noticed the differences of conclusions between Savills report and the previous authors. Please treat them with suitable disdain and weighting

Kind regards