

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 23 September 2026 12:13
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/1312

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 23/09/2026 12:12 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	35 Churchill Avenue Horsham West Sussex RH12 2JP
Proposal:	Subdividing of existing plot and erection of a two storey, three bedroom dwelling. Demolition of garage and creation of vehicle access.
Case Officer:	Daniel Holmes

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	6 Hamilton Road Horsham
----------	-------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Member of the Public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Objection to planning application DC/26/1312 35 Churchill Avenue, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 2JP I live at 6 Hamilton Road and object to this application. I recognise that the proposed house has been reduced from four bedrooms to three and that its footprint is smaller than the dwelling previously refused under DC/25/1668. However, the fundamental issue remains: this is still a substantial two-storey detached house being inserted into a prominent and constrained corner plot whose openness contributes to the character of

Churchill Avenue, Hamilton Road and the adjoining recreation ground.

The earlier application was refused because its scale, footprint and siting would create a cramped and visually intrusive development, fail to reflect the established pattern and spacing of Churchill Avenue, and result in an overly intensive addition to the street scene. The subsequent appeal was dismissed. In my view, the present application does not overcome those fundamental concerns.

The plot subdivision and cramped relationship remain

The submitted information confirms that the proposed plot remains approximately 301 square metres, the retained plot at No. 35 remains approximately 182 square metres, and the separation between the two houses remains only approximately two metres. These are materially the same plot relationships that applied to the dismissed scheme.

Although the footprint of the proposed building has been reduced, the application still seeks to place an additional two-storey dwelling on the same subdivided corner site. No. 35 would still be left with a notably reduced and constrained plot, while the new house would occupy land that currently provides openness and separation at the end of the street.

Reducing the internal accommodation from four bedrooms to three does not, by itself, resolve the effect of the subdivision. The planning issue is not simply the number of bedrooms. It is whether a second two-storey house can sit comfortably within this particular site without appearing cramped, intrusive or out of keeping with the established pattern of development. I do not believe that it can.

Loss of openness and harm to local character

This is a particularly visible corner plot, experienced not only from Churchill Avenue but also from Hamilton Road, the approach to the recreation ground and the surrounding public space. The existing openness is an important part of the setting at this end of the estate.

The proposed dwelling would replace that openness with a permanent two-storey building. Despite the smaller footprint, it would still bring built development considerably closer to the surrounding public space and would appear prominent in views from several directions.

The result would remain an intensive and visually intrusive form of development that does not reflect the established spacing between houses or the more open character at the end of Churchill Avenue. The proposal should not be assessed solely by comparing its floor area with the previous scheme. It must be assessed against the character and capacity of the site itself.

Roof form and visual prominence

The applicant's supporting statement acknowledges that the Council's pre-application advice suggested a hipped roof. The application instead retains a full gabled roof, principally on the basis that it provides a larger area for solar panels.

Renewable energy provision is welcome, but it does not remove the need for the building to respond properly to its setting. A full gable presents a broader and more solid upper-storey profile than a hipped roof and increases the apparent height, width and prominence of the house when viewed from the adjoining streets and recreation ground.

The proposed solar panels do not justify retaining the roof form that creates the greater visual impact. Other roof and panel arrangements should have been considered if a dwelling of an acceptable scale and appearance could genuinely be accommodated here.

Overlooking and loss of privacy

From my home at 6 Hamilton Road, the proposed two-storey dwelling would be clearly visible across the rear of my property, including from my kitchen, conservatory, dining room, rear garden and my young daughter's upstairs bedroom. The submitted elevations show first-floor windows that would introduce new elevated lines of sight between the proposed dwelling and

the principal living and sleeping areas of my home.

I am particularly concerned about the [REDACTED] loss of privacy across almost the entire rear of the house and garden. Occupants of the proposed dwelling would have elevated views towards these private areas, while we would have corresponding views into its windows. This direct mutual overlooking does not presently exist and would materially reduce the privacy and residential amenity of my family home.

This effect cannot be judged adequately from the application site alone or from a two-dimensional plan. I ask the case officer to visit 6 Hamilton Road, or at least to assess the proposal from Hamilton Road and the adjoining recreation ground, so that the actual relationship, levels and lines of sight can be understood.

Trees and landscaping

The loss of vegetation from this prominent garden site has already reduced its green and open character. Further development would leave limited meaningful space for landscaping capable of softening a two-storey dwelling of this scale.

There is also a significant discrepancy in the submitted arboricultural material. The arboricultural report states that the proposal is for a two-storey, four-bedroom dwelling and records a site inspection undertaken in September 2025. It was therefore prepared for the earlier scheme rather than the current three-bedroom proposal.

The Council should not assume that this older report adequately assesses the current design, access arrangement and construction requirements without an updated arboricultural assessment and tree-protection plan specifically tied to the drawings submitted under DC/26/1312. Any proposed replacement planting should also be clearly identified, secured and capable of being retained in the limited space available.

Conclusion

I acknowledge that the proposed house is smaller than the one previously refused. Nevertheless, the same fundamental subdivision is retained, the plot areas and approximately two-metre separation remain unchanged, and the proposal would still introduce a prominent two-storey detached house into an open and constrained corner location.

The reduction in floor area does not overcome the harm arising from the siting of a second dwelling on this particular plot. The development would still appear cramped and overly intensive, diminish the openness of the site, harm the established pattern and visual character of the area, and create a new overlooking relationship with my home and garden.

I therefore ask the Council to refuse the application because it would remain contrary to Policies 25, 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework, particularly the requirements to respect local character, achieve appropriate townscape integration and safeguard residential amenity.

I also request that the case officer undertakes a site visit and assesses the proposal from Hamilton Road, the recreation ground and the affected neighbouring properties before reaching a decision.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**



Horsham District Council, Alberty House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB

Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton