

Sarah Valentine

From:

Sent: 18 December 2025 13:18
To: planninginfo; Joanne Fisher
Cc: Dean Manning
Subject: planning applications - DM/25/3020 and DM/25/3021 - Courthouse Farm, Copthorne, RH10 3LA

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 are not 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 is not 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 its 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 [REDACTED]

