

Regards Planning Application – DC/21/2233- Land North of Glebe Farm and Kings Barn Lane, Kings Barn Lane, Steyning

Statement to be read out by Cllr Vicci Johnson, on behalf of Steyning Parish Council, at the HDC Planning South Committee meeting on Thursday 26 September.

Steyning Parish Council believes that Horsham has not followed its own defined criteria, as set out in the Horsham local plan 2023/2040 when including the proposed Glebe Farm development.

In summary, including a large housing development on Glebe Farm, lacks an understanding of the site's disconnectivity from Steyning and the minimal public transport services currently available. Steyning has a limited range of local services that are already overstretched and a large development on the other side of the bypass, potentially increasing the towns population by 20%, without public transport to those limited facilities, will negate the sustainability of the development economically and socially and damage the environment through increased vehicle traffic through the town and along the A283. We seek explanation as to why this large allocation has been included in the Horsham District local plan, when other new housing is proposed within Steyning that better meets the local plan sustainability criteria AND the local community's needs. 265 houses are well in excess of the figure of 165 homes identified as needed by 2040 in 2 recent housing needs assessments, with existing developments already meeting some of these numbers.

With respect to the local plan, Objective 1 prioritises a 'sense of place' whereby residents feel part of town life and its community. Given its out-of-town location, Glebe Farm is unlikely to achieve a cohesive bond with the rest of the town.

Objective 5 stresses the need for community 'inclusivity' through the provision of infrastructure that prioritises walking, cycling and public transport. The proposed Glebe Farm development does not meet these aims; it's a 15-minute walk for a fit person from 37 Kings Barn Lane to the post office or nearest bus stop, and that involves crossing the Cripps Lane/ Jarvis Lane junction, with poor visibility where car drivers are negotiating a tight bend. The planning

committee report, paragraph 6.11, states that, 'Given the proximity of local services, which are accessible on foot, and the accessibility to public transport links, which would provide access to a range of services in nearby settlements, occupiers of the development would have a genuine choice of transport modes to access local services and employment opportunities' This reads like a work of fiction in our car dependent society. If any housing development WERE to occur on the Glebe Farm site, in order to fulfil Horsham's OWN decarbonisation strategy and local plan sustainability criteria, it would need to be fully accessible by frequent public transport.

It is difficult to justify the inclusion of such a population influx into Steyning as both the local secondary school and medical centre are at capacity, in their provision to Steyning and surrounding villages. The Local Education Authority's response to these plans states that the secondary school is almost at full capacity already, yet in paragraph 6.12 of the planning report, you state that the level of expansion IS appropriate to the settlement of Steyning.

Objective 6 aims to safeguard and enhance the character and built heritage of the towns/villages within the district. There will be no 'net-gain' from the proposed Glebe Farm development in terms of heritage value to Steyning. In fact, as a new development, it could be viewed as detracting from the historic nature of the town.

Strategic Policy 27 emphasises the importance of catering for an ageing population which, in Steyning, is higher than average across the District – with numbers aged over 65 expected to rise to 30% by 2040. This means that it's important to build smaller (downsizing) accessible properties within the town, near to facilities, bus routes and medical provision. Glebe Farm is isolated and does not meet this growing need for older people within our town.

Objective 2 and Strategic Policy 8 aim to reduce carbon emissions and state that developments are required to incorporate 'green' forms of heating without the need to retrofit systems later. This development does not demonstrate carbon neutrality.

Water: The headroom for the proposed development's water neutrality mitigation is noted as very small in the planning report, paragraph 6.161. We cannot see how water neutrality will be achieved even with these mitigations

Southern water in section 6.176 state that the wastewater system CANNOT cope with this development.

Finally, 6.24 of the planning committee report outlines the applicant's commitment to financial contributions to enhance active travel. There has been no consultation with the parish councils in the area about these contributions and we wish to express concern that the white bridge link, a funded Community Partnership Project, has been confused with the WSCC responsibility of replacing the condemned bridge. To suggest that financial support for this project may help get it completed, and that replacing an existing bridge is in some way mitigation, is in our view, wrong and misleading.

In summary, Steyning Parish Council believes this development should NOT proceed because of the NEGATIVE SUSTAINABILITY impact on the environment, our community, and nearby communities.

Agreed by the SPC Planning & Premises Committee on the 23rd September 2024