



Crawley Local Plan

<p>Ref No:</p> <p><i>Office use only</i></p>
--

Crawley Submission draft Local Plan Representation

Please return your completed representation form to Crawley Borough Council.

Representations can be made via this form and emailed to strategic.planning@crawley.gov.uk or sent via post to: Local Plan Consultation, Strategic Planning, Crawley Borough Council, Town Hall, The Boulevard, Crawley, RH10 1UZ. Alternatively, representations can be made online using the [eform](#) which allows attachments of documents.

This form has two parts:

PART A – Personal details

By law, representations cannot be made anonymously. All representations will be published alongside your name, company name (if applicable), and your client’s name/company (if applicable). The Council will use the information you submit to assist with formulating planning policy.

Further information about Data Protection Rights in line with the provisions of the General Data Protection Regulations and Data Protection Act 2018, for example, how to contact the Data Protection Officer, how long information is held or how we process your personal information can be found at www.crawley.gov.uk/privacy. Specific reference to the Local Plan and planning policy related public consultation can be found [here](#).

PART B – Your representation

Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make. You may submit multiple “PART B” sections with a single “PART A” completed.

PART A – Personal details

Please ensure that you complete all fields in 1. If a planning agent is appointed, please enter the Title, Name and Organisation in 1, and complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.

	1. Personal details	2. Agent’s details
Title:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
First name:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Surname:	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Organisation:	<input type="text" value="1 own 2 leasehold properties and one freehold property severely affected by the revised plan [Landlady 1]"/>	<input type="text"/>

Address line 1: [Redacted] [Redacted]

Address line 2: [Redacted] [Redacted]

Town/city: [Redacted] [Redacted]

Postcode: [Redacted] [Redacted]

Telephone: [Redacted] [Redacted]

Email: [Redacted] [Redacted]

PART B – Your representation

3. Please tick the document that you would like to make a representation on:

- Crawley submission Local Plan
- Crawley submission Local Plan Map
- Crawley submission Sustainability Appraisal
- Habitats Regulation Assessment Screening Report

4. Which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate to?

Paragraph: [Redacted]

Policy: EC4

Other: Chapter 9, Section - Strategic Employment Location, Paragraphs 9.47-9.60

5. Do you consider the Local Plan to be: (Please tick)

- 5.1. Legally compliant? Yes No
- 5.2. Sound? Yes No
- 5.3. Compliant with the duty to co-operate? Yes No

6. Please give details explaining your response to 5.1, 5.2, or 5.3 below. Please be as clear as possible.

Before I comment of the plan itself, I must first comment on the consultation process and question whether it has been legally/correctly conducted. I own more than one property severely affected by this plan, and yet it is only by chance that I am even aware of the plan

and the consultation currently in progress. One of my tenants has had the sense to forward me the letter sent by the council to the property address. The council has clearly not done its due diligence in checking the Land Registry to identify the correspondence addresses of the various affected property owners and has instead made the assumption that the property owners reside at the affected properties themselves. All of the properties that I own and that are adversely affected by the plan are registered at the Land Registry together with details of my correspondence address, and clearly showing that it differs from the property address. In contrast to the feeble incomplete notification of this plan and consultation by the Council, the plans and enquiries from Gatwick Airport a year or two ago arrived at my correspondence address in triplicate as I have 2 leasehold and one freehold interest registered at the Land Registry.

In addition, the 6 January 2021 letter sent to the affected properties is misleading when compared with the local plan text in certain important respects. Specifically that letter is worded to give the strong impression that only a small proportion of the identified Strategic Development Land will be developed "It is important to be clear that the anticipated built area of any scheme is much smaller than the allocated site boundary shown in the Local Plan, with the expectation that development is comprehensively masterplanned with appropriate supporting transport infrastructure and landscaping provided to ensure protection of the amenity of nearby properties." This implies that affected local residents should not be concerned by the size of the Strategic Development Land area as only a fraction of it will be developed and that the remainder is specifically to protect the existing residential properties (with the exception of some transport infrastructure needs). By contrast, the Local Plan states in paragraph 9.54 "The site identified on the Local Plan is larger because the significant quantum of industrial floorspace could be supported by complementary uses where justified by evidence, including ancillary uses such as a limited provision of offices and supporting amenity uses that will cater for the needs of the of employees." This implies much more of the land would be developed and that much less of it would be available to create buffers and landscaping to protect existing properties and settlements.

I am astounded that the Council thinks it appropriate or reasonable to surround hamlet and individual isolated rural properties with a business park development and, for the majority of those properties that border the Strategic Development Site to be sandwiched into a narrow strip between the M23 motorway and industrial/business development. No amount of landscaping will address that fact that the properties are being isolated by this proposed development from ANY other area of rural or urban space. The council is minimising the cost to itself by not including compulsory purchase of these properties within the land to be developed, rendering the affected residential properties completely worthless and completely unsaleable. It will literally cause financial ruin to those property owners. Further more paragraph 9.57 comments only on existing properties that border the site and fails to acknowledge that there are properties on Fernhill that are in the middle of the identified Strategic Development Site.

Whilst you might try to argue that the properties were already blighted by the Gatwick second runway proposals, the situation in that case is completely different. In those proposals, the residential properties are included within the perimeter of the expanded Gatwick and therefore would be compulsorily purchased at the indexed fair market value as assessed prior to the existence of the proposals should the development go ahead. The property owners are therefore not adversely affected by the Gatwick Plans from a financial perspective.

You also might try to argue that in the text of the proposals you indicate that there will be "landscaping provided to ensure protection of the amenity of nearby properties" and also that the "built up area of any scheme will be much smaller than the allocated sit boundary shown in

the Local Plan". This does not help at all - and as commented above, the letter from which this quote comes is inconsistent with the Local Plan itself. Any person thinking of buying one of the affected properties would be frightened off by the map included in the plan and would not even bother to read the text for further information. In addition, the text gives no comfort as to what exactly would be done, how close the development would be to each affected property and any safeguards that mean that any buffer between the development and residential properties could not be modified or eroded over time in either future plans or if the plans were implemented. The comment that the development would be a "minimum of 24.1 hectares" also gives further scope to the council to develop a much bigger part of the identified area than is currently suggested so furthering the concern and alarm to any potential buyer of one of the residential properties. In addition you are leaving a number of properties either in the middle of, or bordering a huge building site should the plans be implemented - a further issue that will scare off any potential buyer of a property.

In paragraph 9.58, Flood risk is addressed, and in Paragraph 9.59 consideration of HGV access is discussed. The Sussex County Council track record for both recognising the risks posed and protecting existing properties, services and environment over recent years following the approval of the old Jupps site on Peeks Brook Lane for the much bigger United operator which failed to take into account the impact on the roads (Peeks Brook Lane and Fernhill) and the junction between Peeks Brook Lane and Fernhill which were not designed to cater for such traffic and the junction was not used by the previous operator. As a result the ditches protecting properties at Fernhill against flood are being destroyed by the oversailing HGVs so gradually eroding our flood protection. The BT chamber on the corner of Fernhill and Peeks Brook Lane has been destroyed several times by the HGVs since the change of operator and all the council does is order BT to repair the chamber rather than take action to put in place measures that would prevent the HGV's from oversailing onto the verge and the chamber in the first place. In addition the road surface is being destroyed and the weight of the HGVs using it caused the water main outside 2 Two Ways on Peeks Brook Lane to collapse in 2019. Whilst all this has previously been notified to the council no measures whatsoever have been taken to alleviate or reduce the issue. Indeed the Highways department of Sussex County Council instead in a phone call at the time threatened to remove the curb stones that the HGVs were oversailing so that there was no longer a highways boundary for the HGVs to stay within or any Council property (as opposed to BT property or protective ditches) for them to damage so the council would no longer have a problem that they needed to consider or respond to.

If required, please continue your response on an additional piece of paper and securely attach it to this response

- 7. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to resolve the issues you have identified above. You need to state why this modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It would be helpful if you are able to suggest how the wording of any policy or text should be revised. Please be as clear as possible. Any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination.**

The only way in which this proposal could be considered as reasonable or acceptable is if it safeguards the value of the residential properties adversely affected by the plan. Specifically those in Fernhill and in Peeks Brook Lane that either border the development or are surrounded completely by the development. To do this, these properties would need to be included within the proposed perimeter of the identified land and be compulsorily purchased should this proposal be implemented. As the properties value had already previously been tagged to the value prior to the Gatwick proposals being put forward the relevant value for compulsory purchase, should the Council's Local Plan be implemented, would need to carry through from that earlier value again.

If required, please continue your response on an additional piece of paper and securely attach it to this response

*Your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested modification, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations. **After this stage, further submissions will only be at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues s/he identifies for examination.***

8. **If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate in the public examination hearings?** *(Please tick)*

No, I do not wish to participate in the examination hearings

Yes, I wish to participate in the examination hearings

9. **If you wish to participate in the public examination hearings, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:**

The Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the public examination.

If you would like to make a representation on another policy or part of the Local Plan then please complete a separate PART B section of the form or securely attach an additional piece of paper. Copies of the representation form can also be downloaded from the council's website at: www.crawley.gov.uk/localplanreview

Signature



Date

24/03/2021