

Reserved Matters application for up to 28 dwellings following approval of outline application DC/23/2146 relating to access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

Land South of Furze Common Road, Thakeham, West Sussex

Horsham District Council Reference: DC/26/1236

Representation from:

  
1 Champions Cottages  
Storrington Road  
Thakeham  
Pulborough  
RH20 3EF.

To the Planning Department,

26<sup>th</sup>.September 2026

I wish to comment again concerning this application and to re-emphasise that I am writing as probably the most affected resident adjoining the proposed site. My property, 1 Champions Cottages, sits at the end of the access road to the proposed development and consequently faces not just the site but the roadway leading to it. My concerns revolve around not just the loss of amenity (essentially privacy) by facing the site but the demanding conditions that I will experience by the imposition of a busy and inadequate access roadway particularly with regard to road safety, traffic movements, noise and disturbance. I appreciate the planning inspectorate examined many of these planning considerations and felt they would have a minimal impact but I feel they are real enough, to some degree, when experienced only metres from your property; especially those concerning lack of privacy.

At first viewing this current site layout bears little resemblance to that proposed in the previous application (DC/23/2146) and that subsequently decided at appeal by the Planning Inspectorate (APP/Z3825/W/25/3365902). Is this not contrary to that considered and decided by the appeal to the original application.

The layout of dwellings, roadway and landscaping are a pale shadow of that previously presented to the planning department. Previously the development involved the construction of a balanced mix of for profit and affordable homes sited within the site perimeter. This was at least then enhanced with some thoughtful landscaping to soften and breakup the inevitable harsh built environment. This latest layout has resulted in reduced outer landscaping and a perimeter of dwellings containing an expanse of car parking spaces in the centre.

The layout has also now changed significantly by the substitution of a mixed development for a complete plot area of affordable homes - current depressed market conditions have probably dictated this change. Virtually all the housing types have the same appearance, whether it be the elevational design and construction details to the mix, or non-mix, of building materials, colours and textures. It could be reasonably argued that the new changed housing mix, up from 35% affordable homes on the original, plus the new dwelling designs and site layout, bears no relationship to that adjudicated upon by the planning inspectorate.

I suspect a crucial point of contention, and concern, from all residents that bound this development is the matter of overlooking and loss of privacy to existing dwellings. All existing houses are overlooked to some degree by these new dwellings, not helped by the very basic site layout plan now presented. I would also point out that there appear to be buffer landscape zones, plus gardens, between all new and existing dwellings except on the eastern boundary. Here new gardens and existing gardens butt up against each other with no additional screened separation,

The above is particularly the case for my property, 1 Champions Cottages, which is now nearer to proposed maisonette blocks, units 01/02 and 03/04, than it was to any other structure in previous site layouts. This has real consequences for overlooking from the proposed two first floor maisonettes, nos.02 (in block 01/02) and 04 (in block 03/04), and will result in a severe loss of privacy, particularly as these two first floor maisonettes are inevitably going to be occupied more frequently than say a first floor of a normal two storey house. As planned these two first floor maisonettes allow for large living room windows looking directly over and into 1 Champions Cottages garden and they face directly onto my existing bedroom and living room windows. Obscured glazing would not be possible for these proposed living room windows and a 1.8m.high close boarded fence between the proposed and existing properties provides little screening, particularly from the elevated position of first floor windows.

I feel this is clearly unreasonable to have to relinquish all privacy to my garden and all rooms on the western elevation of my house. It should be noted that the planning inspectorate, in their adjudication to the planning appeal (3365902, pt.14) made direct reference to HDPF, Policy 33 which seeks amongst other things to avoid unacceptable harm to the amenity of nearby neighbours (from new development), by way of noise and overlooking – I assume this includes the loss of privacy that results from all new overlooking dwellings. It is curious that in this particular matter, consideration is given to those dwellings that are located on the western boundary but not on the eastern side of the site.

The problem of there being a lack of privacy, to 1 Champions Cottages, fundamentally stems from the new dwellings being in too close a proximity to the eastern boundary line. A small western movement of the presently proposed site layout would ease privacy issues on the eastern boundary without creating similar issues to that boundary. Repositioning of the SUDs basin to further align with the western boundary line would still maintain a healthy separation gap between existing and new dwellings, and also maintain the distance between all site structures and the protected trees.

In addition to the above and as far as direct overlooking of 1 Champions Cottages is concerned can I suggest that blocks 01/02 and 03/04 be redrawn in a mirror image configuration thereby lessening the overlooking problem from both rear elevation living room windows of each first floor maisonette. Both remaining rear elevation bathroom windows of each block could also be obscure glazed to completely prevent any overlooking. A further measure that might be considered, and to eliminate any possibility of overlooking, would be the re-siting of the rear window, of block 01/02 (in its mirrored layout), to the side elevation so as to face south, towards woodland, instead of east.

Another option that might be considered is the turning of block 01/02 by ninety degrees to present a plain gable wall to the eastern boundary and then reconfigure the rear gardens to suit. This could be done in conjunction with mirror image layout of block 03/04 as described above.

I also note, from the supporting documents, that it is proposed that a 1.8m. high fence be erected around the site perimeter. Can I suggest that along the eastern boundary this be raised to 2.4m. to further enhance screening, that is in addition to the above measures I have already detailed.

Finally, on a fencing theme, a post and rail fence is also proposed down the entire southern length of the access lane; bordering The Orchard. The line marking the boundary between that property, and the watercourse, and the new lane already has a solid full height panelled timber fence with concrete posts. Its removal and replacement with an open post and rail fence would further expose all properties that line the lane. Surely a new solid timber fence could be erected or the existing fence panels be merely replaced utilising the existing retained posts.

I would remind the planning department again that I am writing this email as probably the most affected resident adjoining this proposed site. My property, 1 Champions Cottages, sits at the end of the proposed lane to the proposed development and consequently faces not just the new site but the new roadway leading to it. It is likely to be a double blow to the status quo which no other property bounding this development will experience. Although most concerns regarding

noise, traffic, pollution, etc. were not considered materially important by the planning inspectorate I believe the loss of privacy, as a result of the new site layout, to be more than significant, principally because I will be overlooked, to some degree, on two elevations as the application stands and is presented.

Thank you for your attention to this email and I would conclude by urging the planning department to require further alterations to the application as indicated above. Many thanks.

Your faithfully,

██████████.