

Sarah Valentine

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 December 2024 17:41
To: planninginfo
Subject: DM/24/2770 - Objection

[REDACTED]

My husband and I are joint owners of Winterfield Oldlands Avenue, a property on the same road as Stumble Ridge and an interested party due to our ownership of the land accessible by the access route which forms part of this planning application.

Our objection is for the following reasons

Access and the effect on neighbouring properties.

1. Access for the other land holders

In 1967 the 7 properties on the south of Oldlands Avenue purchased the portion of land behind their house plots. This is subject to an agreed covenant on usage.

This land is accessible via the gated unpaved track between Stumble Ridge and the adjoining property, Lamb Cottage.

This proposal would significantly alter the usage of this track from access only for all 7 land holders to an effective drive way for the new property. There is no consideration for others with access rights

2. Access for the new property

The access way is not wholly owned by Stumble Ridge and the planned access for the new property is insufficient both in scale and standard.

A trackway passable for "exceptional" access for working vehicles does not meet the needs of a property expected to have 3 or more cars.

The planning application does not take these consideration into account and there is no possible alternative given the scale of the existing buildings of Stumble Ridge which make on property access impossible

3. Security issues arising from this change

The 6 other properties whose land shares this access have managed the land and access as a whole and in common. It is unfenced and access is unrestricted once past the locked gate on the access track. The boundaries between the gardens and land are not secure and the impact of a change in usage of the track has not been taken into consideration

4. Impact on Oldlands Avenue

The access route proposed enters Oldlands Avenue very close to an existing junction which is far from ideal Further this road is un-adopted with the maintenance at the cost of the householders based on the property frontage, the impact of an additional sizable property does not appear to have been given due consideration

Wider Impact

5. Impact on the land

The area accessible by the track and owned by the households has been undeveloped and allowed to return to a natural habitat. It is of sufficient note to gain a mention in the publication "The Land of the Brighton Line" (ISBN 978-0-9548638-2-1) in which it is described (page 274) as "archaic meadow".

The proposed development would have a negative impact on this land

6. Extension of the built up area of Balcombe

Part of the proposed area of development lies outside the built up area of Balcombe and is part of both the Balcombe conservation area and the wider area of outstanding natural beauty which should be protected.

The extension of the built up area of Balcombe was widely debated as part of the Balcombe Neighbour Planning and this area was not included for extension

7. The application makes no mention of the impact of the actual build.

What is planned for the removal and disposal of the existing buildings and the soil spoil resultant from the necessary ground works for the new property?

Further, the access for the traffic required for the build and its impact both short and long term on the surrounding properties appears not to have been taken into consideration

The existing property and usage

8. The existing property

The current grassed area of "garden" of the property has been extended beyond the Balcombe Built Up Area and into the land purchased in 1967 which is part of the landscape. This attempted "extension" should be noted.

9. Previous applications

a/ Under application DM/24/1833 the owner was authorised to remove a Blue Atlas Cedar - this was reliant on its replacement by a Deodar Cedar.

It should be noted that while the Blue Atlas Cedar has been removed, the replacement Deodar Cedar has not been planted and indeed had it been replanted it would now need to be removed in order for this application to progress

b/ Under planning application DM/20/2508 to the build the holiday let property (to be removed under this application) permission specifically imposed conditions to block permanent residence on the site in order to preclude the creation of an independent property - this new application seeks to overturn this.

It is therefore concerning that this planning application is for a 3 bedroom dwelling but includes a "cinema" with linked WC making a "conversion" to a 4th bedroom with ensuite a entirely foreseeable amendment.

In objecting to the current planning application may we raise a concern that the applicant is using "salami tactics" to create a separate property which will be treated as and perhaps sold as a independent entity in due course.

Given this we object to the planning application and believe it should be refused.

Yours faithfully


Winterfield
Oldlands Avenue
Balcombe
RH17 6LP