

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 July 2026 11:01:37 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0567
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 04/07/2026 11:01 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	9 Montpelier Gardens Washington West Sussex RH20 3BW
Proposal:	Erection of 2no. semi-detached houses on land to the side of 9 Montpelier Gardens. Demolition of single storey element to side of existing No. 9 and erection of a two storey rear extension to the host dwelling.
Case Officer:	Daniel Holmes

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 7 montpelier gardens washington pulborough

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	Re: Planning Application DC/26/0567 - Further Objection to the Amended Plans I wish to submit a further objection following the submission of the amended plans for planning application DC/26/0567.

This representation should be read in conjunction with my previous objections which remain unchanged and continue to stand in full. Having carefully reviewed the amended drawings, I am firmly of the view that the revisions fail to address any of the substantive planning concerns previously raised. The amendments are minor in nature and do not materially alter the proposal or its overall impact.

The revised drawings appear to comprise only two changes: the addition of an extra parking space serving No. 9 Montpelier Gardens and the introduction of hedge planting to the front of the proposed development. Whilst these amendments are noted, they are superficial and do not resolve the fundamental planning issues associated with the proposal.

The provision of an additional parking space does not overcome the significant highway concerns identified in my earlier objections. On the contrary, it has the potential to further intensify vehicle activity on an already constrained and unsuitable road. Every additional parking space creates further opportunities for vehicles to enter, leave, reverse and maneuver within the site. Given the restricted width of Montpelier Gardens, the absence of footways, the existing parking pressures and the regular difficulties experienced by vehicles attempting to pass one another, these additional maneuvers are likely to increase conflict between vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists.

The application continues to underestimate the existing highway constraints. Residents experience these issues on a daily basis. Vehicles frequently have to stop or reverse because of parked cars, pedestrians are forced to step into private driveways to allow vehicles to pass, and visibility remains restricted at the junction with London Road. None of these existing problems have been addressed by the amended plans.

Similarly, the introduction of hedge planting cannot mitigate the fundamental design shortcomings of the proposal. Landscaping does not reduce the excessive scale, density or cramped appearance of the development. The proposal remains a clear example of overdevelopment, attempting to accommodate an excessive amount of built form on a restricted plot to the detriment of the character and appearance of Montpelier Gardens.

The amended drawings also fail to address my previous concerns regarding the misleading visual representations submitted with the application. They continue to present an unrealistic impression of the available space and openness of the site, significantly understating the cramped nature of the proposed development and its impact on the surrounding street scene. The revised drawings do nothing to correct this fundamental deficiency.

Importantly, none of the amendments address the concerns raised regarding highway safety or the conclusions reached within the supporting transport documentation. The application continues to suggest that Montpelier Gardens functions as a safe shared-surface environment where vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists can comfortably coexist. This bears little resemblance to the conditions experienced by residents. The road has no dedicated footways, vehicles are frequently observed travelling at inappropriate speeds for such a constrained environment, and the existing layout already presents significant challenges for pedestrians and motorists alike.

Likewise, the applicant's conclusion that the development would result in only an "imperceptible" increase in vehicle movements remains wholly unconvincing. Even a modest increase in traffic can have a noticeable impact on a narrow cul-de-sac that already experiences congestion, limited maneuvering space and significant parking pressures. The amended plans do nothing to demonstrate that these concerns have been properly considered.

It is therefore evident that the amendments have not addressed the principal reasons why local residents object to this proposal. They do not alter the scale of the development, reduce its density, improve the relationship between the proposed dwellings and neighboring properties, resolve the highway safety concerns or overcome the existing parking problems. Instead, they amount to minor cosmetic revisions which leave the substantive planning issues entirely unchanged.

Accordingly, I wish to make it absolutely clear that all of the concerns set out in my previous objections remain fully applicable and continue to stand in their entirety. This further representation should be read as supplementary to those earlier objections and not as a replacement for them.

I continue to object to this application on the grounds that it would:

- .Represent an overdevelopment of a constrained site.
- .Harm the established character and appearance of Montpelier Gardens through a cramped and overly dense form of development.
- .Exacerbate existing highway safety issues and vehicle conflict.
- .Increase parking and maneuvering pressures on an already constrained road.
- .Fail to provide a realistic or accurate assessment of the site's existing conditions.
- .Continue to rely upon misleading visual representations that understate the true impact of the development.

The amended plans do not materially change the proposal, nor do they overcome the serious planning concerns previously identified. I therefore respectfully request that the Local Planning

Authority gives full weight to my previous objections, together with this supplementary representation, and refuses planning permission for application DC/26/0567.

Kind regards,

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