

From: [Steve Smith](#)
To: [PL Planning Applications](#)
Subject: WSCC/019/20
Date: 20 September 2020 13:59:42

REF: Planning WSCC/019/20
S.A.Smith
Charleston House
Worthing Road
West Grinstead
Horsham RH13 8LG
[REDACTED]

This e-mail does not include an objection to the above planning but offers some comments. It is sent more in hope than expectation since my last e-mail to WSCC, about unrelated issues on council plans for the A24, sent on about 14/1/20 never did receive a meaningful reply beyond the auto response acknowledgment.

Comment 1.

Clause 9.2 of WSCC/019/20 refers to this address as 'Charleston Farmhouse'. This is incorrect and the word 'farmhouse' should be removed. This is not and never been a farmhouse, it was in the past accommodation for Knepp workers, hence the relationship commented on later at comments 2 and 3.

Comment 2.

The mapping supplied by Dowsettmayhew planning partnership shows the house as 135 and 136 Worthing Road although this is in fact one house.

The map includes all of the land attached to this house title and a portion of Knepp land (between our western border and the proposed noise reducing fencing. This portion is Knepp land that we use on an annual licence. I will refer to this portion of land as 'the Patch'.

I consider the proposed slight repositioning of the fence a touch further west to be both sensible and acceptable.

Comment 3.

The Patch traditionally served the workers cottages that became Charleston House. It was in the past used as a soakaway and rubbish pit.

It still acts as a rain, not surface effluent, soakaway for this house and contains a small void and about three 'sink' wells that collected rain water before the bund caused them to silt up.

Comment 4.

This is not a complaint about the bund which is being built within the parameters of the granted planning.

It has to be said that had I known about it years ago when the planning was granted I may have offered some objections but that is not now relevant.

Living here at the time were two elderly people with a growing dementia and they failed to understand the implications of WSCC letters.

This does not represent any current challenge by. My wife and I appreciate the way Knepp inform us of any activities that may impact on us.

Comment 4.

Although not a WSCC matter I comment that we regularly offer to purchase the Patch from Knepp but I understand their reluctance to sell. We hold easement for pipe maintenance to this land but it has not been necessary to claim it because of the annual licence so far given.

Comment 5.

This refers to the diversity held within the patch.

We have this year been inundated with frogs and toads for an unknown reason. They may have been displaced by the bund but I do not know this. We have protected them as best we can. I cannot locate their spawning spots. I hope to build a small pond on our own land to receive them next year should this continue.

The Patch also appears to hold tree living bats which will not be disturbed by the proposed

fencing relocation which is why I support it.

The general diversity of the Patch, which is just outside the area of the initial ecological survey, is surprising for such a small area. This is another reason I support the plan to slightly move the fence since it minimises an already slight impact on this area which we manage as a small reserve without challenging Knepp's ownership (even though I still want them to sell it to me ☺).

With Thanks.
Steve Smith