

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 06 February 2026 12:53:38 UTC+00:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0027
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 06/02/2026 12:53 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	Lock House Lock Partridge Green West Sussex RH13 8EG
Proposal:	Erection of a pitched roof extension to the east wing flat roof and erection of a single storey extension to the existing outbuilding. (Listed Building Consent).
Case Officer:	Shazia Penne

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 1 Gatehouse Lodge Lock Estate, Lock Lane Partridge Green

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	Dear Sir / Madam, Re: Formal Objection to Planning Application DC/26/0027 for Lock House, Partridge Green, RH13 8EG.

I write to formally object to the above planning and listed building consent applications relating to Lock House.

My objection is based on the cumulative and material increase in the intensity of residential use of the site, which I consider to be contrary to the adopted Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) 2015 and national planning principles.

1. Unacceptable Intensification of Residential Use

Conflict with HDPF Policies 2, 3, 4 and 33

Lock House is currently understood to be a 15-bedroom property, with extant consents permitting an increase to 27 bedrooms which include provision for 2 x holiday let units which cater for any tourism economy needs within the locality and relied upon by the developer. This presents a consented increase of 80% on the current position.

If the linked applications under DC/25/1881 and 1882 and these under DC/26/0026 and 0027 are given consent, this would take the total to 38 bedrooms. This would constitute a massive 153% increase on the current position. Even if the 'super cottage' 8 bedroom application were not permitted, but this latest application were, this would lead to total consent numbers to 30, which presents a 100% increase on the current position.

This represents a significant escalation in residential intensity, well beyond what would reasonably be regarded as proportionate to the original lawful use of the property.

- Policy 2 (Strategic Development) requires development to be appropriate in scale and form to its location.
- Policies 3 and 4 seek to control development in the countryside and prevent inappropriate expansion or intensification that undermines rural character.
- Policy 33 (Development Principles) requires that development does not result in unacceptable harm through over-intensification of use.

The scale of increase proposed would materially alter the nature of occupation of the site and introduce a level of activity more akin to institutional or high-density residential use, which is neither reflected in nor supported by the spatial strategy of the HDPF.

2. Harm to Character and Rural Setting

Conflict with HDPF Policies 2, 4 and 26

The cumulative increase in bedroom numbers across this and the other applications is not addressed and associated occupation increases would fundamentally change the character of Lock House and its setting.

- Increased comings and goings, servicing activity, and general domestic activity at this scale would be incongruous with the rural
-

context.

- Policy 26 requires development to respect local character and landscape setting.
- The proposed intensification would erode the established character of the area and undermine the intrinsic rural qualities that the HDPF seeks to protect.

3. Impact on Residential Amenity

Conflict with HDPF Policy 33

A development accommodating up to 38 bedrooms would inevitably result in:

- Increased vehicle movements
- Increased noise and disturbance, particularly for near neighbours like us.
- Increased parking pressure and activity along Lock Lane throughout the day and night, which will lead to increased risk to users of the lane.

Policy 33 is clear that development should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers through noise, disturbance, traffic, or overuse of a site. This is not withstanding that Lock Lane sits in Flood Zone 3, with no legally consented evacuation route available in time of flood. The magnitude of this latest in a long list of peace meal developer applications gives rise to serious concern that residential amenity impacts have not been adequately addressed or mitigated.

4. Heritage Harm and Cumulative Impact on a Listed Building

Conflict with HDPF Policies 24 and 33

Lock House is a Listed Building, and therefore subject to a heightened level of protection.

- Policy 24 requires that development preserves the significance of heritage assets and their setting.
- While individual alterations may appear modest in isolation, the cumulative impact of repeated extensions, re-purposing of outbuildings and internal reconfiguration to support intensified use risks eroding the historic integrity and domestic character of the building.
- The proposals appear to prioritise maximising accommodation capacity over preserving the building's original function and significance.

This approach is inconsistent with both the HDPF and national heritage policy, which require great weight to be given to conservation.

5. Failure to Properly Assess Cumulative Impact

Conflict with HDPF Policy 33 and Plan-Led Decision Making

The applications appear to be presented incrementally, without sufficient regard to the overall cumulative impact of permissions already granted.

The planning system requires that proposals be assessed not only on their individual merits, but on their combined effect on character, amenity, infrastructure, and sustainability. When

viewed cumulatively, the proposals represent a scale of intensification that is not supported by the development plan.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the proposed development represents an unacceptable and unsustainable intensification of use. These generally prioritise development within defined settlement boundaries and restrict piecemeal expansion or sprawl in countryside settings - underlining that any intensification must be justified and sustainable contrary to the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015, particularly Policies 2, 3, 4, 24, 26 and 33.

I respectfully request that Horsham District Council refuse planning permission and listed building consent for applications DC/26/0026 and DC/26/0027.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



Horsham District Council, Albery House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB
Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton