

# SLAUGHAM PARISH COUNCIL

Sally Mclean - Clerk to the Council Email [clerk@slaughampc.co.uk](mailto:clerk@slaughampc.co.uk) Website: <http://www.slaughampc.co.uk>

## Slaugham Parish Council Planning Committee 24<sup>th</sup> March 2022



### SPC Planning Committee Consultation Response to DM/21/3959

With reference to the Rural Solutions “additional information” paper dated 07/03/22.

#### Page 2. Last para;

SPC do not agree that the lack of comments in objection naturally translates in to unqualified support and a recognition that the proposal will somehow benefit the village.

This proposal will only benefit the applicant. The investment in the estate is a noble undertaking but absolutely fails to address the detrimental effect any increase in traffic will have in an already congested village within a conservation area.

This conservation area was one of, if not the first in Mid-Sussex and given that it was considered special and valuable then; it is absolutely recognised both locally and in the broader community for the value it brings today.

The suggestion that it is worth deteriorating this for the benefit of the applicant or broader “wine tourism” is a gross underestimate of its local amenity value.

This Council were concise in their previous response in that the owners of the Estate should recognise that whilst progress can be a force for good, it must not be to the detriment of the village, its residents, and the surrounding area.

#### Page 3. Traffic.

The comments and consultation referred to under this section do not address the fundamental objection made by this Council and the village residents.

That is the desire by the applicant to direct traffic into the estate by accessing the “front gate” centred in the middle of the conservation area.

The applicant now accepts that construction traffic, agricultural traffic and service vehicles can easily be accommodated by using the entrance on Warninglid Lane. The suggestion that a former estate entrance on Warninglid lane could be constructed and in doing so would be detrimental to the amenity land within the estate is valid, particularly as the comment quite rightly identifies the sensitivity of the estates place within the AONB.

This comment fails to place any regard on the value of the conservation area within the village and the AONB and this fundamental objection is not addressed within either the original proposal or the note of additional information.

The lack of objection from West Sussex Highways Authority to the proposal fails to note that the conservation area does not fall within their remit, nor does any consideration for the additional detrimental carbon emissions, and loss of village amenity.

#### **Page 4.**

The reference in the first paragraph relating to the existing access from The Street having completely unrestricted use is valid in the context of its use for a private residence, which was absolutely its original intent. It is not viable to expect the same unrestricted access for the commercial enterprise proposed under this application.

- The second paragraph on page 4 references the wellness centre being primarily used by the guests of the estate, but we note, not exclusively. This is referenced as supporting vehicle movements within those considered in the TRICS data whereas a better interpretation would be a validation of the data as a minimum.
- The third paragraph again refers to the primary objective of the on-site restaurant is to serve the estates guests and local people; local people of course will be driving to the facility and again validates the potential increase proposed within the TRICS data.
- The fourth paragraph makes the point that a second restaurant within Warninglid is not unprecedented. This is not supported by the facts. There was a restaurant at the Rifleman Inn in until the mid-1990'S over 25 years ago when vehicle movements were considerably less and the local roads were not full of delivery vans and the extra cars occasioned by the overall growth of the national economy and the increase in rural living. This was not a second restaurant as the public house at the time was just that a Pub who at the most sold bar snacks and drinks. It was not the restaurant it has become today.
- The fifth paragraph references the potential for noise from the increase traffic and counters that the noise will be reduced because traffic will be at slow speeds. It again fails to acknowledge that any increase in traffic will be detrimental to the conservation area and the only reason existing traffic is slow is because the area is already congested with residents cars.

We note the additional comments in relation to the utilities and the intentions to improve and manage those moving forward.

SPC still contend that the ambient nature of the conservation area will be irreparably damaged by the projected increase in traffic. The quiet enjoyment the village residents expect and one of the reasons the conservation area was put in place is being threatened for the commercial gain of one enterprise when there is a perfectly adequate entrance off Warninglid Lane that will allow the enterprise to function at no detriment to the conservation area.

Council would like to ask the LPA whether Historic England should have been invited to comment on the proposed application. Could they also guide Council to their published plan for the preservation and enhancement of designated conservation areas as part of their duties under the 1990 Planning Act: DP35 Conservation within the District Plan makes reference to appraisals and management plans.

Should the application be considered for approval we would ask that the LPA make it a condition that Estate implement a traffic plan that asks their patrons/staff etc leaving the site do so via Warninglid Lane. This a similar arrangement that is in place at the South Lodge and Cisswood Hotel's. This would help minimise traffic movements on the Street, particularly at night when this can be disruptive for those that live on the Street, noise and light pollution.

#### **Slaugham Parish Council Planning Response - Summary**

**It is with regret that Slaugham Parish Council do not feel that adequate amendments to the transport plan have been made to enable them to support this application in its current form and therefore object to the proposed development.**