
Sent:

31 January 2026 15:59

To:

Planning

Subject:

Re: DC/25/1946 [REDACTED]

Importance:

High

Categories:

Comments Received

To: Development Management / Planning Case Officer, Horsham Council

Re: DC/25/1946 [REDACTED]

3, Station Road, Billingshurst - Demolition and redevelopment to 3 dwellings

Date: 31st January 2026

Dear Ms. Tinning,

I wish to object to the above application. My comments focus on (1) the accuracy of the red line boundary and ownership certificate, and (2) material impacts relating to highway safety/access, parking provision, construction impacts, residential amenity, and (3) constraints and missing detail relating to trees and water/drainage.

1) Red line boundary includes shared access/driveway - title documentation suggests it is not in the applicant's ownership

The submitted plans show the red application boundary includes the shared access/driveway to Station Road, labelled "Existing access maintained."

The applicant has submitted Certificate A.

HM Land Registry title documentation indicates the shared driveway/access is not wholly within the applicant's ownership. The register for Title SX94628, [REDACTED], (3 Station Road) states the title has the benefit of a "right of way ... over and along the roadway-coloured brown" with a contribution towards repair/maintenance and identifies the roadway as tinted brown on the filed plan, suggesting the roadway is separate from the land edged red in that title.

By contrast, the register for Title SX134713, [REDACTED], (Groom Cottage, 7-9 Station Road) records that the title is subject to rights granted over the "roadway coloured brown" (hatched brown on the filed plan), by the 22nd September 1967 transfer, which strongly suggests the roadway/access is contained within or controlled by the Groom Cottage title (or at least is the land burdened by others' rights).

Taken together, the title documentation strongly suggests that the shared driveway/access is controlled by Groom Cottage, with rights of way for other properties.

Requested action: Please confirm the LPA has verified that the correct ownership certificate has been submitted and any required notices have been served on all relevant owners for land shown inside the red line boundary (including the shared driveway/access).

2) Rights of way and redevelopment intensity: the key issue is increased burden and land control

The title documentation for SX94628 describes rights over the shared roadway.

Even if a right of way benefits the title/land, redevelopment from one dwelling to three dwellings materially increases intensity of use (more vehicle movements, servicing and parking activity). The applicant should therefore be required to demonstrate that they have adequate land control and lawful rights to support the intensified access and parking movements - particularly where the submitted red line boundary encloses the shared driveway and Certificate A has been submitted.

3) Highway safety / access constraints / manoeuvring on a narrow-shared drive

The proposal increases the number of dwellings from one to three and will materially increase vehicle movements and servicing needs using a constrained access arrangement. The council's own response recognises the intensification and refers highways matters for consideration.

This raises concerns regarding:

- safe passing/turning within a narrow-shared access.
- reversing movements and conflict with other residents' use of the driveway.
- practicality of refuse/service and emergency access.
- the safety impacts of increased movements onto Station Road.

Requested action: The application should not be approved without:

- a swept path/turning analysis demonstrating safe manoeuvring for cars and service/refuse vehicles.
- clear arrangements for refuse presentation/collection without obstructing the access; and
- a construction traffic management plan, given the shared and restricted nature of the access.

4) Parking provision is inadequate and inconsistent across the submission pack

The council response letter identifies that the scheme (as assessed there) provides insufficient parking and quantifies a shortfall against guidance: 5 spaces shown vs 7.6 required, a shortfall of 2.6 spaces, concluding insufficient off-road parking.

Separately, the planning application form indicates 6 car parking spaces, and 6 cycle spaces are proposed.

These inconsistencies create real risk of overspill parking, additional manoeuvring and reversing, and conflict within the shared access area.

Requested action: The applicant should reconcile the drawings and forms, so the LPA/Highways consultees are assessing a consistent scheme and demonstrate compliance with parking standards. If revised drawings are submitted, neighbours should be re-consulted.

5) Construction impacts and risk to neighbours' access and property

Demolition and construction for three dwellings will generate significant construction traffic and deliveries. Given the restricted shared driveway/access, there is a heightened risk of:

- obstruction of residents' access.
- damage to the shared access surface and adjacent boundaries.
- unsafe construction vehicle movements, reversing and temporary on street stopping.

Requested action: A detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan should be required before any permission is granted, or at minimum as a strict pre-commencement condition, with enforceable provisions for delivery routing, contractor parking, working hours, and protection/repair of the shared access.

6) Residential amenity: privacy, disturbance and loss of quiet enjoyment

The proposal materially intensifies the use of a constrained access and introduces additional dwellings and parking activity close to neighbouring properties. The cumulative impacts are likely to include:

- more noise and disturbance from vehicle movements and doors/parking activity.
- headlights shining into neighbouring gardens/windows.
- loss of privacy and quiet enjoyment due to increased activity adjacent to existing residential amenity spaces.

Requested action: The proposal should be refused or amended to reduce impacts. If the LPA is minded to approve, conditions should secure boundary treatment, lighting details, and mitigation to prevent unacceptable overlooking/disturbance.

7) Trees / TPO constraints and construction deliverability (parking/access area affected)

The council's response highlights nearby TPO constraints and states that a tree protection plan and arboricultural impact/method statement would be required, noting proposed separation distances may not be sufficient given likely root protection areas.

The submitted arboricultural report (AIA/AMS/TPP) confirms multiple protected trees in the vicinity and identifies that an off-site Oak (T6) sits outside the site boundary but its roots and canopy over sail the car parking area, and that works to remove/install the parking surface require monitoring to avoid damaging the roots; it also states ground protection is required for the duration of the build to prevent compaction.

The same report confirms that detailed drawings of proposed underground services have not been produced at this stage, meaning potential conflicts with tree root protection areas cannot yet be fully assessed.

Requested action: The LPA should ensure the development is demonstrably deliverable within these constraints and impose strict, enforceable tree/ground protection and services-installation conditions (and/or require further detail before determination), particularly where the parking/access area is within the influence of protected trees.

8) Water / drainage constraints: insufficient information, apparatus stand-offs, and water neutrality

Southern Water’s consultation response (16 January 2026) states “Insufficient Information provided” and requests a condition preventing commencement until details of foul drainage disposal have been submitted and approved by the LPA in consultation with Southern Water.

Southern Water also notes their records show existing sewer and water main assets crossing/in the vicinity and that the exact position must be determined on site before finalising the layout.

Southern Water further identifies that a 102mm water main requires a clearance of 6 metres on either side, with restrictions on excavation/mounding/tree planting within that protection zone without consent and requests a condition requiring agreed measures to protect/divert the public water supply main.

They also require secure arrangements for SuDS responsibility and maintenance where not adopted.

In addition, the council’s response confirms the district is subject to water neutrality requirements and that new development must not increase water demand impacts in the Sussex North supply zone.

Requested action: The application should not be approved without full foul and surface water drainage details, evidence that apparatus stand-offs and protection requirements can be met, and secured long-term SuDS responsibilities, alongside compliance with water neutrality requirements.

Summary / Request

For the reasons above - particularly the red line/Certificate A issue relating to the shared access (with reference to Titles **SX94628** and **SX134713**) and unresolved highways/parking constraints, I request that the application is refused, or at minimum not determined until the ownership certification and access/parking evidence is corrected and robustly assessed, and until the above tree and water/drainage constraints are properly addressed.

[Redacted signature block]

[Redacted signature block]

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted signature]

Groom Cottage, 7–9 Station Road, Billingshurst