

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 May 2026 23:23:35 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0567
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 11/05/2026 11:23 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	9 Montpelier Gardens Washington West Sussex RH20 3BW
Proposal:	Erection of 2no. semi-detached houses on land to the side of 9 Montpelier Gardens. Demolition of single storey element to side of existing No. 9 and erection of a two storey rear extension to the host dwelling.
Case Officer:	Daniel Holmes

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: The Hamble, Melton Avenue Storrington, West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	The design and access statement states that the site is, 'underutilised'. I feel this is not true because the space between no.7 and no.9 helps to define the pattern and rhythm of the

existing built form and contributes to the overall street scene. The gap is necessary to avoid a sense of overdevelopment and a congested massing of built form.

The cross-sectional elevations do not accurately reflect the existing ground levels, showing it flat. However, the ground level rises from no.7 towards no.9. It is critical to understand where the changes in level occur with all neighbouring properties as this will inevitably have an impact on several factors which determine the overall feasibility of the proposal. For example, this could potentially impact the vehicle tracking and radii. Before this application is determined it would be necessary to scrutinise a comprehensive 3D vehicle tracking and radii report. The current vehicle tracking shows car movements over land owned by no.7. As one of the owners of this land, I do not give permission for this, which makes the current proposals untenable. Regarding the parking, I feel that there is insufficient space to safely park in the designated bays without encroaching on the land of neighbouring properties. The four proposed parking bays are at right angles to the narrow single-track carriageway. For reasons of practicality and safety, many properties adopt parallel parking in the narrow sections of the street. Currently, two cars are parked at no.9, where will these be parked in the future? There is insufficient space in front of no.9.

The design and access statement states that, 'the proposed dwellings sit at a slightly lower level relative to the neighbouring houses due to the topography of the site.' However, the elevations show that the ridgeline of the new properties is consistent with no.9. This is also higher than the ridgeline of neighbouring property, (no.7). Therefore, the suggestion that the proposed built form sits lower and is therefore less impactful is not true. An accurate longitudinal cross section is necessary to determine the impact of the proposals with the neighbouring properties, accurately showing relative ground levels and ridge heights.

The design and access statement states that the proposed new properties are to be set back from the prevailing building line. The existing rear garden is sloping up towards the back fence, and therefore the proposed new buildings would need to cut into the existing slope, potentially generating much spoil material. How many lorry movements will be required to achieve the proposals?

How will the changes in levels be achieved, in particular the transition across the boundary between no.7 and the proposed new dwellings? What will be done to ensure the stability of the neighbouring garden, boundary fence and garage at no.7? The fence is the property of no.7.

The design and access statement shows images of slate and render. The existing local building materials are strongly brick face and plain tile. The form and design of the proposed new

properties is not sufficiently different from the existing to warrant a change in the materials. Hence, slate and render would appear incongruous in this setting.

Will the existing hedging in front of no.9 be retained?

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



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