

From: [Richard Burrett](#)
To: [Peter McNamee](#); [Ian Gibson](#)
Cc: [Noel Atkins](#); [Zack Ali](#); [Janet Duncton](#); [Dawn Hall](#); [Julian Joy](#); [Pieter Montyn](#); [Simon Oakley](#); [Ashvin Patel](#); [Brian Quinn](#); [Sean McDonald](#); [Sarah Sharp](#); [Jacquie Russell](#); [PL Planning Applications](#)
Subject: RE: Evergreen Farm (WSCC/004/20) planning application
Date: 27 June 2021 09:33:18

Dear Mr McNamee,

Thank you for your message, which I have read with interest and passed on to the County Council's Planning Team. Please note that I will only be in a position to take a final view and decision on this application at the Planning and Rights Of Way Committee meeting once I have heard all of the relevant arguments and considered all of the relevant material considerations.

I would, however, like to reassure you that I will read all representations which have been sent to me in advance of the Committee meeting, and will take their contents into account when deciding on how to vote at the meeting itself.

With best regards,

Richard Burrett
West Sussex County Councillor, Pound Hill Division.
Chairman, West Sussex County Council Planning and Rights Of Way Committee.

From: Peter McNamee <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 26 June 2021 15:42
To: Ian Gibson <Ian.Gibson@westsussex.gov.uk>
Cc: Richard Burrett <richard.burrett@westsussex.gov.uk>; Noel Atkins <Noel.Atkins@westsussex.gov.uk>; Zack Ali <Zack.Ali@westsussex.gov.uk>; Janet Duncton <janet.duncton@westsussex.gov.uk>; Dawn Hall <Dawn.Hall@westsussex.gov.uk>; Julian Joy <Julian.Joy@westsussex.gov.uk>; Pieter Montyn <pieter.montyn@westsussex.gov.uk>; Simon Oakley <simon.oakley@westsussex.gov.uk>; Ashvin Patel <Ashvin.Patel@westsussex.gov.uk>; Brian Quinn <brian.quinn@westsussex.gov.uk>; Sean McDonald <Sean.Mcdonald@westsussex.gov.uk>; Sarah Sharp <Sarah.Sharp@westsussex.gov.uk>; Jacquie Russell <Jacquie.Russell@westsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Evergreen Farm (WSCC/004/20) planning application

Dear Ian

I am writing to you about the planning application at Evergreen Farm, West Hoathly Road, East Grinstead (WSCC/004/20) which the WSCC planning committee will be determining on Tuesday. I am also cc'ing the other members of the planning committee into this email as well, in the hope that they may find the time to read it.

I am very concerned about this application and the safety impact it will have on the roads and also the impact on local residents and East

Grinstead generally.

I will firstly try to show how the proposal does not comply with some of the material planning considerations:

1. I do not believe that the application is “acceptable in terms of the impacts on landscape character and the AONB” (quoted from Key Issues in report by Head of Planning service). This is because it doesn’t meet with Policy W13(c)(i) of the West Sussex Waste Local Plan which refers to protected landscapes (see 9.24 of Report by Head of planning service): “there is an overriding need for the development within the designated area.”

- The only evidence presented that waste is leaching off the site is that the seasonal stream on the site does not meet the national standard for a fresh water stream. Though the standard is not met, it does not say how mild or severe this deviation from the standard is.
- Undesirable pollutants have been found in bore holes, but this is what you would expect from an old landfill.
- Most of the focus is on so called potential risk however, this has not been quantified.
- There is no independent verification of the level of waste on the surface of the site. From what I have seen this is very minor. The site was only stopped being used for grazing when one of the joint owners left and took her horses with her. My neighbours kept their ponies on the site for nearly two years (around 2017) and they had a large area to roam with no problems.
- The Environment Agency while not objecting to the proposal, I do not state at any point that they think the capping is necessary.
- The only consultation response I could find which says the capping is necessary was the Mid-Sussex Contaminated Land Officer who said: “Ultimately the site contains contaminates

and we would want to encourage and support the voluntary remediation that is proposed.” This hardly seems to be saying that there is an “overriding need” for the capping.

- As far as anyone in the Standen area is concerned there has been no evidence or talk of any leaching or problem with the site until the planning application was submitted.

2. I do not believe that the application is “acceptable in terms of highway capacity and road safety” (quoted from Key Issues in report by Head of Planning service).

- A road safety audit has only been performed on the immediate entrance/exit of the site (see documents 0043 Road Safety Audit and [0043 Evergreen Farm \(A2\) fp0043.10 Vehicle Tracking Plan.pdf \(kb\)](#))

- This means that no comments have been made on safety along the rest of the route from the A22.

- There have been hundreds of public objections from people who know these roads, which demonstrate the many danger points along the route. These objections are hardly mentioned in the Head of Planning’s report.

- The East Grinstead Town Council consultation response says: “Without proper consideration, communication with an emphasis on safety for all users of the route that is being considered, there could very well be fatalities.” Like so many residents the town council evidently see how dangerous the proposal is (even if they remain on the fence on whether to support it or not).

- The applicants planning statement is misleading and contains a number of miscalculations in the quantification of changes in HGV traffic along the route (please let me know if you want further details of these).

- Now that the plan is to keep HGV deliveries outside peak hours it will mean there are even more HGV journeys very close together. The potential for accidents, hold-ups and

serious disruption is therefore magnified.

- For WSCC Highways to approve this plan defies common sense to anyone who knows these roads. It is evidently going to cause major disruption, potential accidents and decrease quality of life for those along the route, especially St Hill Green.
- Why has Highways not looked seriously at safety along the route?

3. I do not believe that the application has “an acceptable impact on local amenity and the local environment” (quoted from Key Issues in report by Head of Planning service).

- The increased HGV movements will have an unacceptable impact on road pollution around the school and along the rest of the route.
- There will be issues turning between the A22 and Imberhorne Lane and all along the route, especially at St Hill Green and West Hoathly Road, not to mention the crossing between Imberhorne Lane and Saint Hill Road (none of which are discussed by the applicant or Highways).
- Despite the measures to mitigate, there will still be unacceptable noise and dust levels coming from the site. The concerns of people who have objected have been given little attention in the Head of Planning’s report. To summarise some main concerns:
 - The National Trust believes the traffic and work will significantly negatively impact visitors enjoyment of the AONB, the property and amenity area.
 - The care home next to the site believes it’s vulnerable residents will be badly affected by the works (Public Comments, Mark East) despite the mitigation around timing and building earth banks that have been proposed.
 - The bus company submitted an objection and it is clear that there are going to be lots of delays of buses due to

congestion in the narrow roads.

- o The peace and beauty of the whole area will be disturbed by this especially of Rocking Hill wood.
- o There is a risk (although mitigation has been put in place) that the works will cause pollutants to leave the site and move into the rest of the very environmentally sensitive environment.

I understand that there may be long-term benefits of having the site capped. However, this needs to be weighed up against the costs of having it done. I believe the cost to the community in terms of safety risk, traffic congestion and pollution and disruption to people's lives outweighs the benefits.

I urge you and the other Planning Committee members to read thoroughly the public comments received, as they have not been given enough attention in the planning report.

I urge the Committee if it does in the end approve the application, to explain to the residents of East Grinstead why it is confident that the proposal is necessary, safe in terms of road accidents, and acceptable in terms of the effect it will have on the town. I really think it is possible that someone could be killed or seriously injured by one of these HGVs.

Thank you for your consideration of this email

Kind regards

Peter McNamee

1 Standen Cottages

East Grinstead

RH19 4NE