

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 September 2026 10:59:47 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 19/09/2026 10:59 AM.

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: 49 Oakwood Partridge Green Horsham West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	OBJECTION TO APPLICATION DC/26/1383 Land to the north of Woodlawn, High Street, Partridge Green I wish to object to this outline application for the erection of a detached dwelling. Our home and rear garden immediately adjoin the northern boundary of the application site, and we would be

directly affected by the proposed development.

My objection is based on the following material planning considerations.

1. Previous refusals and dismissed appeal

The planning history of this site is highly relevant. Applications DC/04/0743, DC/05/0858 and DC/06/0864 for residential development on this land were refused. The subsequent appeal relating to DC/06/0864 was also dismissed.

The earlier decisions identified serious concerns including:

- Loss of outlook for neighbouring occupiers.
- An overbearing and oppressive relationship with the relatively shallow gardens to the north.
- Loss of privacy and potential overlooking.
- The constrained backland character of the site.
- The proximity of a dwelling to surrounding homes and gardens.
- A cramped form of development with an inadequate relationship to neighbouring properties.

During consideration of an earlier application, a planning officer visited our garden and raised clear concerns about the effect of development close to our boundary upon our outlook and privacy. Those concerns are reflected more formally in the Council's previous reports, refusal reasons and subsequent appeal history. Although planning policy has evolved since those decisions, the fundamental physical constraints of the site have not changed. Our garden still immediately adjoins the northern boundary, the surrounding gardens remain relatively limited in depth, and the application site remains a constrained parcel of backland garden enclosed by existing residential properties.

2. The current application would fix the position of the dwelling

Although this is an outline application, access and layout are matters for determination now. If permission is granted, the principle of constructing a dwelling and its position within the northern part of this constrained site will have been established. When measured approximately from the submitted plan at its stated scale, the closest part of the proposed dwelling appears to be only around 6-8 meters from the northern boundary. The Council is requested to verify the precise distance before determining the application.

This proposed position places substantial built development in close proximity to our garden and recreates the fundamental relationship which caused concern under the previous applications.

The applicant's planning statement acknowledges that the earlier refusals raised concerns about the limited depth of neighbouring gardens, overlooking, loss of outlook and the relationship with neighbouring properties. However, the current submission does not provide sufficient measured or objective evidence to demonstrate that those concerns have been overcome.

3. Insufficient information to assess residential amenity

The application does not include elevations, site sections, finished floor levels, maximum ridge or eaves heights, a maximum number of storeys, detailed massing parameters or clearly verified

separation distances.

Without this essential information, it is not possible to assess properly:

- The degree of enclosure that would be experienced from our garden.
- The potential overbearing effect of the proposed building.
- Loss of outlook from our home and garden.
- Potential overlooking and loss of privacy.
- Overshadowing and loss of daylight.
- The effect of existing or proposed differences in ground level.
- Whether a building of reasonable and realistic proportions could be accommodated in the position shown without harming neighbouring amenity.

The planning statement repeatedly asserts that "sufficient separation distances" exist, but it does not identify those distances or provide any objective assessment to support that assertion.

The applicant suggests that window positions, height, massing, landscaping and boundary treatments can be addressed at the reserved-matters stage. However, that does not demonstrate that the layout being considered now is acceptable.

The possibility of arranging windows differently at a later stage does not address the fundamental impact of locating a building of unknown height and mass close to our garden boundary. Privacy within a garden may also be harmed by oblique views and the general perception of being overlooked, not only by direct views between facing windows.

4. Overbearing impact, enclosure and loss of outlook

Our concern is not simply the loss of a preferred private view. It is the material effect of substantial new built form on the outlook, openness, privacy and residential amenity presently enjoyed from our home and garden.

A dwelling in the proposed location would introduce substantial built development immediately beyond what is currently experienced as an open garden boundary. Depending upon its eventual height, roof form, massing and finished floor level, it could dominate our outlook and create an unacceptable sense of enclosure.

These are essentially the same physical and residential-amenity concerns identified in the earlier refusal and appeal history. The applicant has not demonstrated, through elevations, sections or defined building parameters, that the present layout would avoid that harm.

Because the siting and layout would be fixed by this outline permission, it is not sufficient to defer the information needed to establish whether a building in that position would be acceptable until the reserved-matters stage.

5. Inappropriate backland development and harm to local character

The undeveloped garden character of this land contributes to the spacious pattern of development in this part of Partridge Green.

The proposed dwelling would be positioned behind the established High Street frontage and closely enclosed by the

gardens of existing properties.

The fact that only one dwelling is proposed does not automatically make the development acceptable. The relevant question is whether this particular site can accommodate a dwelling of realistic proportions while retaining an appropriate and neighbourly relationship with the surrounding houses and gardens.

The submitted plans and planning statement do not demonstrate convincingly that the development would preserve the spacious garden character of the area or avoid appearing cramped and intrusive.

The proposal therefore risks introducing an incongruous form of backland development that would fail to respond appropriately to the established pattern and character of its surroundings.

6. Landscaping cannot be relied upon to overcome the harm Landscaping is reserved for later consideration. The planning statement says only that existing boundary planting will be retained "wherever practicable". This provides no certainty that the vegetation presently contributing to privacy, screening and the character of the boundary will remain.

Landscaping should not be relied upon to make an otherwise unacceptable relationship between a new dwelling and existing neighbouring gardens acceptable. Planting can fail, be removed or take many years to mature. Conversely, very high screening immediately alongside neighbouring gardens can itself cause enclosure, shading and loss of outlook.

The acceptability of the fixed layout must therefore be demonstrated without relying on uncertain future planting as the principal mitigation.

7. Inadequate assessment of the site's constraints

Only a limited set of documents accompanies the application.

There is no detailed assessment of the relationship between the proposed dwelling and the northern properties, no cross-section through the proposed dwelling and adjoining gardens, and no assessment of the actual outlook from the homes most directly affected.

The application also lacks detailed information concerning existing boundary vegetation, trees, ground and finished floor levels and the proposed treatment of the northern boundary. These matters are directly relevant to whether the fixed layout is capable of accommodating a dwelling without unacceptable harm.

A decision should not be made on the basis of general assurances where the submitted information does not allow the Council or neighbouring residents to assess the likely effect of the development properly.

8. Current national and local planning policy

The applicant's planning statement was prepared before publication of the revised National Planning Policy Framework on 17 August 2026 and relies upon the superseded 2024 paragraph numbering. The proposal should be determined against the current national policy position.

Policy DP3 of the current National Planning Policy Framework

requires development proposals to respond to the history, character and features of their site and setting so that they integrate successfully with their surroundings. It also provides that proposals which conflict with this requirement or with relevant development-plan design standards should be refused without clear justification.

Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework require development to achieve a high standard of design, respond appropriately to its context and safeguard the amenities of existing occupiers.

For the reasons explained above, the submitted information does not demonstrate compliance with these requirements.

Conclusion

The application has not demonstrated that a detached dwelling can be accommodated in the position shown without causing unacceptable harm to the privacy, outlook and residential amenity of the properties and gardens immediately to the north.

The previous refusals and dismissed appeal are important material considerations because they addressed the same constrained site and the same fundamental relationship with neighbouring properties. The present application relies largely upon unsupported assurances and the deferral of essential details to a later reserved-matters application.

However, access and layout are being determined now. The acceptability of the proposed siting must therefore be established at this stage, supported by sufficient information regarding separation distances, height, massing, levels and the relationship with neighbouring properties.

I respectfully request that Horsham District Council refuse application DC/26/1383 because the proposed layout has not been shown to safeguard neighbouring residential amenity or respond appropriately to the character and physical constraints of this backland site.

The proposal conflicts with Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework and with the design principles in Policy DP3 of the current National Planning Policy Framework. I also respectfully request that the case officer visits our property and views the application site from our rear garden before reaching a recommendation. This is essential to understand the limited depth of the adjoining gardens, the present outlook and openness, and the likely effect of placing a dwelling close to the northern boundary.

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 Eaton