

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 May 2026 23:03:28 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 28/05/2026 11:03 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	82 Bedford Road Horsham West Sussex RH13 5BH
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey rear extension.
Case Officer:	Meg Bayliss

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	80 Bedford Road Horsham
----------	-------------------------

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 - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Writing OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION DC/26/0616 82 Bedford Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH13 5BH I wish to object to planning application DC/26/0616 at 82 Bedford Road, Horsham.

Although the application is presented as a single-storey rear extension, the proposal must be considered in the wider context of the apparent intensification of the property into a high-occupancy House in Multiple Occupation (HMO), together with development works that have already commenced on site.

The proposal raises serious concerns regarding overdevelopment, residential amenity, planning accuracy, parking pressure, drainage infrastructure and compliance with Horsham District Council planning policies and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Overdevelopment of a Constrained Site

The proposed rear extension, combined with the side infill extension already constructed, represents an excessive and cramped form of development on a very small Victorian terraced plot.

The extensions cover the majority of the remaining garden area and extend significantly further than neighbouring properties despite the application site being smaller than surrounding plots. The cumulative scale and footprint of development appear dominant, overbearing and entirely out of keeping with the established character of the terrace.

The proposal would leave extremely limited usable outdoor amenity space for future occupiers and would materially harm the openness and spacious character of the rear garden environment. This conflicts with HDPF Policy 32 - The Quality of New Development, which requires development to respect the scale, character and spacing of surrounding development and avoid overdevelopment.

The proposal also conflicts with NPPF paragraph 135, which requires development to be sympathetic to local character and create places with a high standard of amenity.

Harm to Character and Appearance of the Area

The proposal fails to respect the character and appearance of Bedford Road and the surrounding Victorian terrace properties.

In particular:

- the side return has been fully infilled in a manner not seen on neighbouring properties,
- the rear extension projects substantially beyond neighbouring rear building lines,
- the scale and massing appear visually excessive,
- and the proposed materials and brickwork appear unsympathetic to the surrounding terrace.

The development would create a visually intrusive and overdominant form of built development that would erode the established pattern of rear gardens and open space.

The rear gardens currently create a sense of openness and continuity between properties despite the urban nature of the area. This proposal would materially reduce that openness and contribute to a more enclosed and overbuilt environment.

This conflicts with HDPF Policy 32 and NPPF paragraphs 131 and 135.

Incorrect Site Boundary and Ownership Concerns

There are serious concerns regarding the accuracy of the submitted plans and ownership certificate.

The submitted red-line boundary appears to include land outside the applicant's ownership, including:

- the shared rear and side access passage,
- land jointly owned by neighbouring properties,
- and land understood to belong to No. 80 Bedford Road.

This appears to materially overstate the size of the application site and understate the true extent of overdevelopment and loss of amenity space.

The inclusion of land outside the applicant's ownership raises concerns regarding whether the ownership certificate is accurate and whether the application has been correctly validated.

The Council should verify the accuracy of the site boundary before determining the application.

Inaccuracies and Inconsistencies within the Submitted Plans

The submitted plans appear inconsistent and inaccurate in several respects, including:

- ceiling heights,
- roof structure,
- chimney arrangements,
- ventilation details,
- boundary relationships,
- and the relationship between existing and proposed works.

There are also concerns that elements already constructed on site do not match the submitted drawings.

Given the apparent inconsistencies between the plans and the built works, the Council should undertake a full site inspection and require clarification before determining the application.

Poor Standard of Residential Amenity

The overall layout appears designed primarily to maximise bedroom numbers within a highly constrained footprint rather than provide a good standard of living accommodation.

The communal kitchen/dining area:

- lacks natural light and external outlook,
- does not appear large enough to comfortably accommodate likely occupancy levels,
- doubles as a circulation route to rear bedrooms,
- and would provide a poor-quality communal environment for future occupants.

The absence of natural light within the only communal living space creates a particularly poor living environment and would discourage meaningful communal interaction between occupiers.

Outdoor amenity space is also extremely limited and inadequate for the likely level of occupation.

This conflicts with HDPF Policies 32 and 33 and paragraph 135(f) of the NPPF, which require development to provide a high standard of amenity for future occupiers.

HMO Intensification Concerns

Although planning permission and HMO licensing are separate matters, the likely HMO use and resulting intensity of occupation are material planning considerations.

The layout appears capable of accommodating six double bedrooms and potentially a significantly higher level of occupation than a standard dwellinghouse.

This raises serious concerns regarding:

- over-occupation,
- living conditions,
- pressure on local infrastructure,
- refuse and recycling arrangements,
- cycle storage,
- parking demand,
- and overall suitability of the accommodation.

The proposal represents an inappropriate intensification of use on a constrained site.

Parking, Bin Storage and Infrastructure Pressure

Parking within the surrounding area is already under significant pressure, with many residents unable to park close to their homes.

The proposal provides no additional off-street parking despite the likely increase in adult occupancy associated with the HMO-style layout.

No satisfactory provision has been demonstrated for:

- refuse storage,
- recycling,
- cycle storage,
- or general servicing arrangements associated with a high-occupancy property.

The proposal therefore conflicts with HDPF Policy 41 and the Horsham Parking Standards SPD.

Drainage and Sewer Concerns

There are serious concerns regarding drainage infrastructure and sewer protection.

Foundations appear to have been constructed directly over or extremely close to a shared public sewer without the necessary Southern Water consent or statutory clearance distances.

The proposal also introduces multiple ensuite bathrooms connected to aging Victorian drainage infrastructure, raising concerns regarding:

- sewage surcharging,
- drainage failure,
- odours,
- and long-term infrastructure capacity.

The extensive development of the site also substantially reduces permeable garden area and raises concerns regarding surface water drainage and run-off.

This conflicts with HDPF Policies 35 and 39.

Potential Unauthorised Development

Works appear to have commenced before planning permission was granted.

The side infill extension already constructed may exceed permitted development limitations, particularly in relation to boundary height, and may therefore require express planning permission.

There are concerns that the development currently on site does not lawfully benefit from permitted development rights.

The Council should fully investigate this matter through planning enforcement and compliance processes before determining the current application.

Loss of Light, Outlook and Increased Sense of Enclosure to No. 80 Bedford Road

The development has already caused significant harm to the residential amenity of No. 80 Bedford Road, particularly through the loss of natural light and outlook to the neighbouring kitchen and living room windows.

The side infill extension has introduced a substantial brick-built wall directly along the shared boundary, in very close proximity to the windows serving the main habitable rooms of No. 80. Prior to the works, these rooms benefited from a more open aspect and a reasonable level of daylight from the side return area. This openness has now been significantly reduced.

The extension creates an oppressive and overbearing sense of enclosure when viewed from both the kitchen and living room windows. The proximity, height and continuous massing of the new wall materially restrict daylight entering these rooms and has noticeably darkened the internal living environment.

This impact is particularly harmful because the affected rooms are primary living spaces within the neighbouring property and are used on a daily basis. The reduction in natural light materially affects the comfort and quality of the accommodation enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers.

The harm is further exacerbated by the fact that the extension appears out of scale with neighbouring development patterns. No comparable side infill extensions exist immediately adjacent and the development therefore creates an unusually dominant and intrusive built form within a tightly constrained terrace setting.

The proposal is therefore contrary to HDPF Policy 32, which requires development to protect the amenity of existing occupiers and avoid unacceptable impacts through overbearing form, enclosure and loss of light. It is also contrary to paragraph 135(f) of the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires development to secure a high standard of amenity for both existing and future users.

The Council should give significant weight to the harmful impact the development has had, and will continue to have, on the living conditions of the occupants of No. 80 Bedford Road.

Fire Safety and Means of Escape Concerns

There are concerns regarding the lack of a suitable secondary means of escape in the event of a fire at the front of the property. Given the HMO-style layout and the location of rear bedrooms behind lockable internal doors, it is unclear how safe emergency escape arrangements would operate for future occupiers.

This raises further concerns regarding the suitability of the proposed accommodation for intensive occupation.

Construction Impacts, Safety Concerns and Neighbour Disturbance

The construction process has caused prolonged disruption and distress to neighbouring residents over many months.

Concerns raised include:

unsafe construction practices,
exposed foundations,
unsupported roof structures,
continual contractor activity,
excessive noise and disturbance,
and intimidating behaviour experienced by neighbouring occupiers.

Residents have also raised concerns with the approved inspector and building control representatives which appear not to have been adequately addressed.

Request for Full Investigation

Given the significant number of inaccuracies, planning concerns and apparent breaches already identified, I strongly request that Horsham District Council undertake:

a full planning compliance inspection,
investigation into potential unauthorised development,
consultation with Southern Water,
consideration of HMO licensing implications,
and verification of the submitted plans and ownership boundaries before any decision is made.

For the reasons set out above, I respectfully request that planning permission for application DC/26/0616 be refused.

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