

23 June 2026

FAO: Kate Turner
Senior Planning Officer
Horsham District Council

By email only

SLR Project No.: 433.066607.00001

**RE: The Copse Phase 2 – Application Reference DC/26/0355
Response to Case Officer's Comments**

Construction of up to 23 residential dwellings, (including 9 affordable homes), including access, parking, landscaping, and other associated infrastructure works.

On behalf of our client, Starbuild Ltd., we would like to respond to the following comments received from the Case Officer.

1. Architect

Comments received from Case Officer 8th June 2026.

1. *Are you sure there will be no overlooking to the rear gardens of 'Welcome Place' from the 2.5 storey properties proposed?*
2. *Plot 1: as you enter the new development you will be met by a blank facade. Is this acceptable or could you add the bay windows or some other interest to the flank wall as well as or instead of the chimney. Even windows would help create interest as you enter? We have examples of where blank façades can really detract from a development, especially in such an important part of the development.*
3. *Plots 2 and 3. Like the gable details at the front- could plot 1 have this? Can any additional first floor windows be added to the side elevations without overlooking?*
4. *Plots 6 7 8- could these have at least one upper floor side window? Especially plot 8?*
5. *Plot 11: Inconsistency in the drawings- is there a chimney or not?*
6. *Plot 17: The rear elevation (which is at the side) is totally blank. I understand you are avoiding overlooking but surely there could be at least a stair window and potentially ground floor? This blank façade will be visible from the street and appear unattractive/ bland. Also plot 17 is the first full house you come across as you enter the development and should be as interesting and attractive as possible to invite the eye.*
7. *Plot 18: Side elevation- can this be broken up at all?*
8. *Plots 21 and 22- really like the use of the timber here- could this be incorporated anywhere else – particularly at the more prominent properties such as 12? 11? 1? 23?*

9. *The CGIs show brick boundary walls and hedges which I really like and would not want close-boarded fence next to any roads/ paths if avoidable. Plot 21 on the CGI shows fencing which will be really visible from the open space- this should we wall or hedge if possible. If it has to be timber fence it should be a high quality fence in muted colours rather than standard close board.*

Response

Point 1: The minimum distance to avoid overlooking is 21m rear to rear. As shown below the distance from plot 08 for example is 32.34m this together with the landscape buffer and existing tree coverage is more than acceptable to avoid overlooking.



Point 2: We feel that the addition of the bay would cause issues and feel squeezed due to its proximity to the 2m footpath which cannot be moved. We have mirrored plots 01 and 12 to allow for outward facing windows.

Point 3: We do not believe that there is any value in adding in side windows – these will potentially overlook parking areas which can also create privacy issues at only 7m distance, and will result in overlooking.

Point 4: Other obscure windows have been added to flanks of other plots where suitable.

Point 5: There is not a chimney on Plot 11, please see amended drawing FL25-2301-125A - HT 06 (Plot 11) Plans, Elevations & Section.

Points 6 & 7: Similar to plots 2 and 3 these flanks look onto parking and a turning head – we feel that these flanks will not be seen too clearly from street scene.

Point 8: Plots 01 and 12 now feature timber weatherboarding and additional windows for more interesting elevations in key locations. Please note that these have been picked up in the revised street scenes and CGIs.

Point 9: The wall referred to in the CGI is a light brick wall to match plot 21. We have walls on all main street scenes and close board fencing in rear gardens that won't be viewed from streets.

In addition to amending the plans and drawings we have also amended the DAS.

In line with the comments above, we are submitting the following updated architects plans:

- 2301-View-01B
- 2301-View-02B
- 2301-View-03B



- 2301-View-04C
- FL25-2301-010B - Design and Access Statement
- FL25-2301-055K - Proposed Site Layout
- FL25-2301-056C - Proposed Site Layout – Coloured
- FL25-2301-057B - Proposed Site Sections
- FL25-2301-060C - Building Heights
- FL25-2301-061C - Building Mix
- FL25-2301-062C - Parking Strategy
- FL25-2301-063C - Tenure Plan
- FL25-2301-064C - Refuse Strategy
- FL25-2301-080-B - Proposed Street Scenes
- FL25-2301-081-B - Proposed Street Scenes
- FL25-2301-099 - HT 01 (Plots 01 & 12) - Plans, Elevations & Section
- FL25-2301-100A - HT 01 (Plot 23) - Plans, Elevations & Section
- FL25-2301-105A - HT 02 (Plots 02 & 03) - Plans, Elevations & Section
- FL25-2301-115B - HT 04 (Plots 6-8 & 14-16) Plans, Elevations & Section
- FL25-2301-121A - HT 05 (Plots 18-19) Plans, Elevations & Section
- FL25-2301-125A - HT 06 (Plot 11) Plans, Elevations & Section
- FL25-2301-126A - HT 06 (Plots 17 & 20) - Plans, Elevations & Section
- FL25-2301-130A - HT 07 (Plots 21 & 22) - Plans, Elevations & Section

We look forward to receiving confirmation that our responses above, along with the submitted plans and drawings, address the comments raised by yourself and that no further information is required.

Should you have any questions or wish to discuss any submitted report or plan, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Regards,

SLR Consulting Limited

Debra Higginbotham

Associate Planner - Planning

