

**Sent:** 08 January 2026 09:23  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** DC/25/1991 Brambledene

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

**Categories:** Comments Received

From: Woodedge Hampers Lane 7 Jan 2026

Dear Sirs,

We have inspected the plans online and have considerable reservations regarding the size of the proposal and the impact on the privacy and amenity of Woodedge.

For comparison, between the plans originally approved in 1976 and the current proposals, we would draw to your attention that Woodedge remains as approved by HDC in 1976.

The bungalow has served as a comfortable home for nearly thirty years for a couple [REDACTED]

The owners of Woodedge have attempted, due to the close proximity of the two dwellings, to live next to each other whilst respecting the rights of each party.

Woodedge did not object to the extensions to Brambledene in 2007 despite some minor reduction in privacy.

However, the owners of Woodedge submit that the current proposals are on a different scale and will impact their privacy and amenity to an extent that they would expect to be safeguarded under HDPF policy 33.2

No mention is made of any impact on the privacy and amenity of Woodedge.

It is important to note that any permission granted remains with the property [REDACTED]

It is also important to note that the Heath Common area has the benefit of additional planning considerations in the Heath Common Design Statement, adopted by HDC as SPD. Planning policy does move on over time. However, we submit that the provisions of the HCDS apply to the current application.

We also question the lack of any Design and Access Statement. It is by no means clear that the occupants have reasonable access for construction plant and construction materials without the co-operation of the owners of Woodedge. The extent of the two drives are clearly delineated by fencing. However, the Woodedge land extends to the tarmac marking the area of Hampers Lane covered by the right of access for others along Hampers Lane as well as the Public Bridleway status.

Woodedge are in possession of a letter from HDC dated 28 February 2000 regarding the private rights of Woodedge in relation to their frontage.

1) Changes to the garage and impact on the street-scene.

The changes to the garage are suggested to be extravagant [REDACTED] and unduly disproportionate in their effect on the amenity of the occupiers of Woodedge.

Officers are requested to ask Building Control if the opening in the side of the garage in lieu of the current side door can be undertaken without any impact on the unitary structure of the garage block in which the owners of Woodedge have a stake.

[REDACTED]

Additionally, in planning terms, it would be difficult to resist a reciprocal application by Woodedge. The result would be a frontage of two dwellings which would extend to some 27 metres wide in total. It is submitted that that would be prominent in the street-scene and out of keeping with the prevailing character of detached dwellings set in spacious surroundings, with the garage as subservient to the main dwelling. The Heath Common Design Statement is relevant.

2) Changes to the rear of the dwelling, on the north elevation close to Woodedge.

It is important to note the care which went into the original design for two dwellings in 1976.

The patio area behind the garage constitutes a valuable area of quiet and privacy. The extension to the original wall on the north elevation the main side of the house is considerably closer to Woodedge, some eight metres from the boundary. This may well suffice in a Horsham town centre setting, but does not sit comfortably in Heath Common. The owners of Woodedge are not able to reconfigure their dwelling due to the relatively narrow frontage. The extended wall on the north elevation will be highly visible and imposing from the only south facing window in their lounge.

It is around an additional five metres (difficult to scale from an A4 print).

Additionally, the bi-fold doors on the side adjacent to Woodedge may be delightful for the occupants of Brambledene, but will likely lead to more noise and loss of amenity in the rear garden privacy of Woodedge.

Officers are requested to consider this carefully in connection with HDPF policy 33.2.

The impact on amenity derives both from the depth into the rear garden and the closer proximity to the common boundary.

3) Extension on the south elevation. Officers are requested to consider the resting water level in this area. It may be desirable to check the ability of any remaining open ground to absorb surface water during periods of heavy rainfall. It is important to note that Brambledene sits close on its southern elevation to the unmade track leading to Crosswinds and two other dwellings. Brambledene sits at a somewhat higher level and water runoff is a possibility. It is important to consider this at a time when there is a live application at Crosswinds under reference Dc/25/1356.

In conclusion, the owners of Woodedge submit that the proposals are too ambitious, and harmful to the privacy and amenity of the owners of Woodedge.

Brambledene has already benefitted from an extension in 2007.

We ask for refusal of the current application.