

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 September 2026 20:57:25 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/1383
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 28/09/2026 8:57 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Land To The North of Woodlawn High Street Partridge Green West Sussex
Proposal:	Outline Application for the erection of one detached dwelling, with some matters reserved except access and layout.
Case Officer:	Sam Nye

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	55 Oakwood Partridge Green Horsham
----------	------------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Overdevelopment - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	OBJECTION TO APPLICATION DC/26/1383 Land to the north of Woodlawn, High Street, Partridge Green Representation from the occupier of 55 Oakwood I wish to object to outline planning application DC/26/1383 for the erection of a detached dwelling. My property, 55 Oakwood, is immediately adjacent to the application site. The submitted layout shows the proposed

dwelling positioned in very close proximity to my property and garden, with the access to the proposed backland dwelling also passing alongside the vicinity of No. 55.

I am therefore particularly concerned about the direct effect of the proposed layout upon the residential amenity of my home and garden.

My objection is based upon the following material planning considerations.

1. The proposed layout would create an unacceptably close and overbearing relationship with 55 Oakwood

The fundamental problem with this proposal is the position in which the new dwelling is proposed.

The submitted site plan places substantial new built development immediately adjacent to the established residential environment of No. 55 and its garden.

At present this part of the site has the character and openness of garden land. Introducing a separate dwelling in the position shown would materially alter that relationship and has the potential to create a significant sense of enclosure and dominance when experienced from my property and garden.

This is not an objection based simply upon the loss of a private view. My concern is the effect of substantial built form upon the outlook, openness, privacy and overall residential amenity of an existing neighbouring property.

This distinction is particularly important given the constrained nature of the site and the proximity shown on the submitted layout.

2. The application does not provide enough information to demonstrate that the proposed position is acceptable

The application does not provide the information necessary to assess properly the impact of a dwelling in this location upon No. 55.

In particular, there are no detailed elevations or sections establishing the relationship with my property, and insufficient defined information concerning the eventual height, ridge and eaves levels, massing, roof form and finished floor levels of the proposed dwelling.

Without this information, it is not possible to assess reliably: the degree of enclosure and dominance experienced from No. 55 and its garden;

the effect upon outlook;

potential overlooking and loss of privacy;

overshadowing and effects upon daylight;

the effect of any differences in ground level; and

whether a dwelling of realistic proportions can actually be accommodated in the position shown while maintaining an acceptable relationship with No. 55.

These are not minor architectural details. They go directly to the question of whether the layout being considered now is capable of accommodating a dwelling without unacceptable harm to neighbouring residential amenity.

3. Layout is being determined now and the fundamental issue

should not be deferred to reserved matters

I recognise that this is an outline application and that some detailed matters may properly be dealt with later.

However, layout is a matter for determination under this application.

If outline permission is granted on the basis of the submitted layout, the position and relationship of the proposed dwelling to neighbouring properties will have been established in principle. It would therefore be inappropriate to rely upon a future reserved-matters application to resolve a fundamental problem created by the siting itself.

Changing window positions or adding screening at a later stage cannot necessarily remedy an inherently overbearing relationship between a substantial residential building and an existing neighbouring home and garden.

The Council should therefore be satisfied at this stage, on the basis of adequate objective information, that a realistically sized dwelling can occupy the proposed footprint without unacceptable effects upon neighbouring occupiers.

The present application has not demonstrated this.

4. Privacy and overlooking of 55 Oakwood

The proximity of the proposed dwelling also raises significant concerns regarding privacy.

Because detailed elevations and window positions have not been provided, it is impossible to assess accurately the extent to which windows and other habitable areas of the proposed dwelling could overlook No. 55 and its garden.

Furthermore, privacy should not be considered solely by reference to direct window-to-window distances.

The residential amenity of a private garden can also be materially affected by oblique overlooking and the perception of being overlooked from a substantial dwelling positioned close to its boundary.

The applicant should therefore demonstrate now that the proposed layout is capable of providing an acceptable degree of privacy rather than assuming that this can subsequently be solved through window design or landscaping.

5. Previous refusals and dismissed appeal are highly relevant to the physical constraints of this site

The planning history deserves particular consideration.

Previous applications DC/04/0743, DC/05/0858 and DC/06/0864 for residential development on this land were refused, and the subsequent appeal relating to DC/06/0864 was dismissed.

The previous decisions identified concerns including loss of outlook, an overbearing relationship with relatively shallow neighbouring gardens, privacy and overlooking, the constrained backland character of the site and the proximity of development to surrounding homes and gardens.

I appreciate that those decisions were made under an earlier policy framework and that the present application must be considered under current policy.

Nevertheless, the physical characteristics of the site and its

relationship with the surrounding established properties remain material.

The site has not become less constrained simply because planning policy has subsequently changed.

The present application should therefore provide convincing evidence demonstrating how the physical and residential-amenity problems previously identified have been overcome.

In my view, the current submission does not do that.

6. Cramped and intrusive backland development

The application site is surrounded closely by established residential properties and gardens.

Although only one dwelling is proposed, that does not in itself establish that the development represents an acceptable use of this particular site.

The relevant issue is whether a dwelling of realistic proportions can be accommodated while maintaining an appropriate relationship with surrounding homes and gardens.

The proposed position appears to place the dwelling into a constrained part of the site immediately behind and alongside existing residential properties.

I am concerned that this would result in a cramped and intrusive form of backland development, inconsistent with the established relationship between the surrounding houses and their garden areas.

7. Vehicle access would introduce additional activity alongside No. 55

The proposed access is also relevant to my property's amenity.

The submitted layout indicates that vehicles serving the proposed backland dwelling would travel immediately alongside the vicinity of No. 55.

A new dwelling would inevitably introduce additional vehicle movements and associated activity into this currently quieter residential relationship.

The potential effects include engine and vehicle noise, headlights, manoeuvring and general activity associated with residents, visitors, deliveries and servicing.

I ask the Council to assess this not only as a highway matter but also specifically in terms of the residential amenity of No. 55.

This is particularly relevant because adopted HDPF Policy 33 expressly identifies overlooking and noise when requiring development to avoid unacceptable harm to nearby occupiers.

8. Landscaping cannot remedy a fundamentally unacceptable relationship

I do not consider that existing or future landscaping should be relied upon to overcome problems resulting from the proposed siting.

The applicant's indication that existing boundary planting would be retained "wherever practicable" provides no certainty that vegetation presently contributing to screening and privacy will remain.

Planting can die, be removed or take years to mature.

Conversely, substantial screening immediately alongside a

neighbouring garden can itself create additional enclosure and shading.

The Council should therefore determine whether the layout itself is acceptable without relying upon uncertain landscaping to mitigate an otherwise unacceptable relationship.

9. Conflict with current local and national planning policy

The Council confirms that its currently adopted Local Plan remains the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF).

Policy 32 - The Quality of New Development requires, among other things, development to complement locally distinctive character and to contribute to a sense of place through the way buildings and spaces integrate with their surroundings.

More directly, Policy 33 - Development Principles requires development to avoid unacceptable harm to the amenity of occupiers of nearby property and land, including through overlooking or noise. It also requires scale, massing and layout to relate sympathetically to the built surroundings and requires development to respect the character of the surrounding area.

National policy has also recently changed. The Government published a replacement National Planning Policy Framework on 17 August 2026, which supersedes the December 2024 NPPF.

The current NPPF includes Policy DP3 - Key principles for well-designed places, addressing the relationship between development, its context and the creation of well-designed places. The current framework also provides a strong policy basis for refusing proposals that, without clear justification, conflict with its principal design requirements or applicable development-plan design standards.

In my view, the information submitted with this application does not demonstrate that the proposed fixed layout can satisfy these requirements, particularly in its relationship with 55 Oakwood and the other immediately surrounding residential properties.

Conclusion

I respectfully request that Horsham District Council refuse application DC/26/1383.

The fundamental concern is not simply that development is proposed on the site, but that the applicant has not demonstrated that a detached dwelling of realistic height, scale and massing can be accommodated in the position shown without unacceptable effects upon neighbouring residential amenity.

The close relationship with 55 Oakwood, together with the potential for enclosure, overbearing impact, overlooking and loss of privacy, effects upon outlook and light, and disturbance associated with the access, requires proper assessment before the layout is approved.

These concerns are reinforced by the previous planning history, where residential development of this constrained site generated materially similar concerns.

Given that layout is being determined now, these fundamental issues should not simply be deferred to reserved matters.

I also respectfully request that the case officer visits 55 Oakwood and views the proposed development from my property and rear

garden before reaching a recommendation. A site visit would enable the Council to appreciate the actual relationship between the proposed dwelling, the access, my home and garden, and the constrained nature of the site.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



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 E aton