

Hamish Evans

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 November 2024 15:41
To: Hamish Evans
Cc: Kevin Toogood
Subject: Comments on application DM/23/2493
Attachments: Heathy Ridge 1937 Conveyance.jpg; Acacia Visibility Splay 139m-Model.pdf; WSX222303.jpg; Heathy Ridge, Copthorne Road, Copthorne.pdf

Dear Mr. Evans,

I would like to submit the attached for the record. They have been submitted previously either in this or in connection with previous applications, but I thought it would be useful to pull them together.

Two of the attachments, Heathy Ridge 1937 Conveyance.jpg and WSX222303.jpg, show drawings used in conveyances of 1937 and 1998 respectively. They are wholly consistent with the current WSCC boundary position drawing submitted by the applicant as fig 2.1 Transport Technical Note, and also a drawing provided by WSCC on the 31st July 2024 (attached).

The boundary position shown in fig 3.1 Transport Technical Note is not consistent with any of the above documents. It has been positioned arbitrarily either by mistake or as a false representation intended to benefit the applicant. It is not possible to survey the boundary as it doesn't exist on the ground, and Yes Engineering are disingenuous to suggest otherwise. Either way, the conclusions of the Transport Technical Report should be set aside, and the applicants planning application refused on grounds of not demonstrating control of visibility splays.

I do have sympathy with MSDC's and WSCC's position, I appreciate it is very difficult to set aside a so said independent and expert report. However in this case there is ample evidence that the Transport Technical Note is incorrect. One only has to plot the Total Station coordinates onto any electronic mapping showing the boundary to show that figure 3.1 is inaccurate. I think it is reasonable that this level of scrutiny should be applied in the circumstances, especially as the Transport Technical Note attempts to overturn the universally accepted prior position of WSCC, MSDC, the sites prior owners and myself. And it is only necessary to see that figure 3.1 incorrectly positions the boundary to reject the reports conclusions.

If granted, I will challenge a planning consent at Judicial Review.



