From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 December 2024 20:50:45 UTC+00:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/24/1077
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 09/12/2024 8:50 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Barrington House Barrington Road Horsham West Sussex RH13 5SN
Proposal:	Variation of Condition 1 of previously approved application DC/19/0379 (Conversion of existing dwelling and outbuildings into two dwellings) for external extensions and alterations.
Case Officer:	Bethan Tinning

Click for further information

Customer Details

Address:	1 Barrington Road Horsham

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Loss of General Amenity
Comments:	As the owners of the neighbouring property to the proposed development - 1 Barrington Road - we strongly object to the proposals that are currently before you. In considering the boundary we share with the application site - and we lie to the north of that - and the existing two storey development that already extends up to that boundary on the application site, we enjoy only a residual 'gap' of approximately

9.0 metres (and then only above an existing 2.4m high garden wall) through which a significant proportion of our natural light, and all of our sunlight, falls onto our garden and the facades of our dwelling.

The application proposals seek to reduce that gap by well over 2.1m by virtue of a grossly overbearing two-storey rear extension of Barrington Cottage and then even further by increasing the height of the garden wall by almost a metre.

The rear-facing windows in the proposed two-storey extension will look directly down our garden and into our private space. Any privacy will be irretrievably lost. It is bad enough having windows directly overlooking our garden from the two-storey barn and any further overlooking would obviously not be welcomed. And it is not appropriate to conclude that because the existing situation is bad any further imposition over our land will not matter.

It would be difficult to imagine a more flagrant disregard for our amenities in what is our family home.

An earlier application DC/14/2274 - for broadly similar proposals - was refused and dismissed on appeal for reasons of the adverse impact upon the neighbouring (our) property's amenities. Why would the applicant consider that revisiting comprehensively unacceptable proposals would result in a different outcome? It is noted that pre-application advice was neither sought nor given and so there is no presumption in favour of approval that might have thereby been indicated.

The Planning Statement which supported this application states that 'On its own such an extension would fall within the parameters for permitted development' Clearly that is not a true statement. It would fail by virtue of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A.1(i).

Whilst the application drawings are (seemingly deliberately - there are no floor levels shown, for example) vague, it is clear that the two-storey extension cannot be constructed as illustrated on drawing 1053-23A because there is not sufficient depth for normally accepted construction between the head of the rear-facing windows on the west elevation and the flat roof finish. This would have the effect of requiring either the ceiling finish in the extension (or its floor level) to be lowered or the flat roof finish to be raised - the latter materially affecting the application proposals. If the construction is to be specialised in order to overcome that obvious design defect then it ought to have been identified within the application documentation.

It is not clear why it would be necessary to raise the height of the garden wall so much over the Garden Room/Kitchen when a flat roof might just as easily have been proposed. Perhaps in

combination with a lowering of the ground floor level. As it is, the raising of the garden wall would be completely overbearing and lead to a measurable diminution of our amenities by virtue of a material loss of both sunlight and natural light, both of which are already compromised by the configuration of existing development.

Whilst not a planning matter, it should be noted that the proposals will require a party wall award under Section 6 of the Party Wall Act 1996. The applicant really ought to have made the not unreasonable assumption that the adjoining owners (us) would not give consent to any notice served under that section of the Act and have then built into the proposed design measures to overcome our objections that, on the balance of probability, will require a further material alteration of the proposals in order to implement them.

This application appears to be a cynical attempt to seek approval to enlarge proposals that have previously, in essence, been refused and dismissed on appeal. There is a point beyond which the clear and obvious diminution of our amenities renders the development unsustainable by any definition. And that is in contradiction with the National Planning Policy Framework where permission should be granted unless ' ...any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits ....' In this case, the benefit is not to the stock of housing in Horsham or the architectural, natural and environmental quality of the area but only to the commercial profit of the applicant. The adverse impacts are entirely to be borne by us.

There is no discernible need for this application and no tangible benefit arising from it. Yet there is a clearly demonstrable diminution in our amenities and so we believe, and strongly encourage you to believe, that it should be refused.

Kind regards