



WINNERS, CRUISE SHIP INTERIORS AWARDS 2024
BEST DINING SPACE BEST STATEROOM
IRTH, AROYA CRUISES BALCONY CABIN, ASUKA III
WINNER, INTERIOR DESIGN
SHIPPAX RO-PAX AWARD 2024
MANXMAN



From: [REDACTED]
Date: Sunday, 27 September 2026 at 20:47
To: planning@horsham.gov.uk <planning@horsham.gov.uk> [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: Considerations for Planning Application DC/26/0954

Hi all,

I would please like the following to be taken in to consideration during the consultation for planning application DC/26/0954.

Supporting my objection points 1 to 6 below, I have also taken time to create supporting photographs, critical dimensions, and important supporting information. This information can be found in the below we-transfer file -

<https://we.tl/t-0VOy7poSzJiH2vM2>

Can I please request that you send me a quick email to confirm that you have received and downloaded this Wetransfer link successfully. There should be total of 6 individual PDF files. If there is any issue with receiving this supporting information, then please let me know as soon as possible.

Objection planning application DC/26/0954 points 1 / 6 below -

Objection planning application DC/26/0954: Point 1 –

Resident Field Access –

The residents of Weald Close have had field access gates since the 1960's which leads onto the culvert land (Ref: SX46976) owned by Persimmon - Ideal Homes LTD. This is not part of the development land on plot (Ref: WSX3442150) owned by the current owners. We would appreciate the fences being removed and previous existing access re-granted.

Objection planning application DC/26/0954: Point 2 –

Retaining 10% biodiversity net gain –

10% biodiversity net gain should be adhered too. We request that the hedgerows removed by the owners should be re-planted plus the 10% biodiversity net gain added too. We also ask that the UK recommendations for the two +24m high established oak trees should be respected. These are not protected oaks but concerning the 10% biodiversity net gain it makes great sense to avoid foundations within the UK recommended 30m route zone from the trunks of these trees.

Objection planning application DC/26/0954: Point 3 –

Boundary ownership –

The culvert land (Ref: SX46976) owned by Ideal Homes / Persimmon as marked on the land registry title number SX46976 is not part of Mr and Mrs Brazils land boundary & should not be

included in the boundary of their new housing developments. It should be moved 3 metres from the fences of Weald Close / Athelstan Way.

**Objection planning application DC/26/0954: Point 4 –
Use of culvert ditch for surface water run-off.**

With regards to the surface water drainage report C3852, REV P2, POINT 2.1.1 - We strongly advise and object against any water run-off from hard surfaces such as roads, pavements, roofs, & parking areas as marked in blue on the attached plan by CGS Civils coming from the proposed new building works flowing into the culvert ditch. The culvert would not cope from the increased speed of flow coming from hard surfaces when it already struggles with slow-release ground water saturation, currently running at a much slower speed coming from the grass hill. The proposed new hard surfaces will cause flooding in heavy rain if the culvert is used in this way.

Secondly the soakaway pond proposed by the owners, as highlighted in green we consider as a high flood risk. Water flow from the drainage ditch (owned by Ideal Homes) would flood this pond from run-off water coming from the land. We have had instances where the resident's gardens have flooded, which means the water level must be higher than the proposed new pond being suggested.

**Objection planning application DC/26/0954: Point 5A:
Distance of proposed new build properties.**

Horsham District Council's published guidance states that:

"The rear window to rear window distance between any habitable rooms ... should be at least 21 metres where first floor windows of separate properties that face each other." 23 Weald Close measures only 17m257mm window to window with the new double story property being suggested which will not comply with (HDPF, policy 33).

Can we also please strongly advise that the site plans include our new extension, as they have missed this, and still show our old house layout. This is particularly important as it makes the new properties even closer that is currently being shown.

To comply with HDC's minimal 21m distance guide, several proposed new properties should be relocated from the existing plan accordingly if planning consent is gained.

**Objection planning application DC/26/0954: Point 5B:
Over development property density.**

The proposed density of properties is thought to be too close together in comparison to the more generous spacing on Weald Close due to very small proposed gardens. This is out of character with other properties in the area and is way too densely populated comparably with surrounding the properties.

Suggestion - For our privacy better spaced single story bungalows would be more appropriate for such a hill site.

**Objection planning application DC/26/0954: Point 5B:
Elevation of double story properties**

The hill gradient imposes on the privacy of residents on Weald Close due to the elevation of new properties being higher than the existing properties. This is both invasion of privacy, as well as restricting residents' daylight in the morning, evening and winter low sunlight position, and will have huge impact on our indoor daylight and outside garden.

Consideration: If the planning development is approved, we'd like to have stipulated that only a 1-story building should be allowed along the boundary fences at a distance of at least 21 metres from existing properties (as stipulated in HDC's recommendations). There should also be no artificial light system installed or pathway. Any windows facing the existing properties should use an obscure glass system.

Objection planning application DC/26/0954: Objection 5D:

Public appreciation of green space.

The bridleway is a well-used path linking access to Chesworth Farm. The field provides views to the wider Muggeridge Field. Buildings would not be in keeping with the current landscape.

Consideration - Such densely positioned properties would be visually inappropriate for such an area of outstanding beauty and should form part of the consideration for site approval by WSCC.

Objection planning application DC/26/0954: Point 6 –

Loss of privacy due to hill gradient position of properties.

Our concern is the serious loss of privacy and residential amenity that the proposed development would cause to our property number 23 Weald Close.

The site proposed for development is elevated approximately between (2m208 /5m194) higher than the level of our home. This difference in ground level is particularly important when considering the effect of the proposed development on our privacy. The proposal includes two-storey properties, meaning that the upper floors and windows of these dwellings will be positioned considerably higher than our existing property. As a result, there is a significant risk that residents of the proposed properties will have clear and intrusive views directly down into our property and private garden. The height of the proposed two-storey dwellings could create an elevated viewpoint from which our home and garden would be overlooked. This is very different from a conventional neighbouring development where properties are situated at approximately the same ground level. In this case, the difference in levels could substantially increase the extent and severity of overlooking.

We are extremely concerned that:

- 1) The development is approximately (plus three metres) above the level of our property.
- 2) The proposed two-storey dwellings will further increase the height from which our property could be overlooked.
- 3) Upper-floor windows could provide direct views into our garden and potentially towards windows within our home.
- 4) The elevated position could allow occupants of the proposed properties to look down into areas of our garden that currently enjoy a reasonable expectation of privacy.
- 5) The development would permanently alter the existing relationship between our property and the surrounding area.
- 6) The significant loss of day light to the windows of our property, and garden due to the site's hillside elevation.

I would therefore ask the Planning Authority to consider the difference in ground levels, rather than assessing the relationship between the properties solely by measuring horizontal distances. I respectfully request that the Council carefully examines the proposed finished floor levels, building heights, roof heights, window positions and sightlines from the upper floors of the proposed dwellings towards No. 23 Weald Close.

I would also ask the Council to consider whether any proposed landscaping or screening would provide effective privacy protection given the approximately the (2m208 /5m194) elevated height difference. Screening at ground level may not prevent overlooking from upper-floor windows situated above our property.

We are not objecting simply because development is proposed nearby. Our concern is specifically the unacceptable impact that the elevated, two-storey development would have on our privacy and enjoyment of our home.

We respectfully ask the Council to take these concerns into account when determining application DC/26/0954 and to give particular consideration to the effect of the site's gradient and the proposed building heights on our house and in general the entire street of Weald Close, as we shall be looking down on the entire street with of such an elevated gradient and double story property heights.

[REDACTED]

Best regards,

[REDACTED]

23 Weald Close
Horsham
West Sussex
RH13 6HE

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

