

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 07 July 2026 13:40:30 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0616
Categories: Comments Received

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 07/07/2026 1:40 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	82 Bedford Road Horsham West Sussex RH13 5BH
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey rear extensions (Part Retrospective)
Case Officer:	Meg Bayliss

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	3 Waterfield Close Horsham
----------	----------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Other
Comments:	Dear Ms. Bayliss, Further to my objection letters of 27/05/26, 08/06/26 and 25/06/26, I am aware of the distinction between the planning and House in Multiple Occupancy (HMO) licensing regimes. I appreciate that they are separate regulatory processes and that Environmental Health has been consulted. The submitted plans do not simply show a single-storey rear extension. They show the creation of a sixth ensuite bedroom within what is proposed to operate as a 6-bedroom HMO. The extension therefore appears to have no independent purpose

other than to intensify the occupation of the building.

In those circumstances the planning assessment must consider the planning consequences of the completed development that the extension is specifically designed to enable rather than just the physical extension on its own.

Planning decisions are required to consider the development that is actually proposed and its planning impacts. Where building works are intrinsically linked to an intensified use, it is difficult to see how the physical works can properly be divorced from the use they are intended to facilitate. I would therefore appreciate clarification as to how the proposal as a whole is assessed rather than viewing the extension in isolation.

I am particularly concerned that the extension appears to be one component of a wider proposal to establish a 6-bedroom HMO, with the HMO licensing application being pursued separately. Whilst I fully accept that planning permission and HMO licensing serve different statutory purposes, I am concerned that considering the extension in isolation risks overlooking the planning consequences of the additional bedroom.

For example, the extension creates the sixth bedroom yet, as stated previously in my objection letters, the only communal space serving all 6 occupants remains an entirely internal kitchen/dining room with no external window, no natural daylight and no natural ventilation. The dining provision consists of linear seating facing a wall and appears capable of accommodating only five diners despite the proposed occupation by 6 unrelated residents. The kitchen does not function adequately and is unsafe.

These are not matters of HMO management or licensing alone. They are directly relevant to the planning question of whether the completed development provides an acceptable standard of living accommodation for future occupiers.

HMO licensing establishes minimum statutory standards. Planning policy applies a different and broader test, namely whether the development provides satisfactory living conditions and acceptable residential amenity.

Accordingly, I would be grateful if you could identify the specific policies within the Horsham District Planning Framework that have been applied in assessing the quality of accommodation created by this proposal and explain how the proposal complies with those policies.

In particular, I would welcome clarification of:

- how the adequacy of communal accommodation has been assessed for a 6-bedroom HMO
 - how the absence of natural daylight and natural ventilation to the only communal living space has been assessed from a planning
-

perspective

- whether the cumulative impact of creating a sixth bedroom has been considered in determining whether the proposal represents an acceptable standard of residential accommodation
- whether the poor layout presents a non-functioning and unsafe environment
- whether you consider that the planning impacts arising from the sixth bedroom can properly be assessed independently of the extension that creates it, and if so, the planning basis for that approach.

I would be grateful if these matters could be addressed within your report so that it is clear how the proposal has been assessed against the Development Plan as a whole, rather than solely against HMO licensing standards.

Thank you for your consideration.
Kind Regards.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**

Horsham District Council, Albery House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB
Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton