From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 26 October 2024 10:48:54 UTC+00:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/24/1526
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 26/10/2024 11:48 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	High Larches Melrose Place Storrington West Sussex RH20 3HH
Proposal:	Erection of a 2 bay carport.
Case Officer:	Shazia Penne

Click for further information

Customer Details

Address:	Hollybank Melrose Place Storrington

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Overdevelopment
Comments:	As you are aware the Application for a Garage/Carport was roundly rejected in 2018 and there is no material difference between that and this application. Only the Garage was approved and the Carport was erected without approval, although it is not even in accordance with earlier applications. It is the subject of enforcement and clearly no further Applications should be entertained, until enforcement has been implemented. To recap:

1. HDC's report said that "garages should be modest". But the frontal elevation of the Garage/Carport would be over 60 feet long and over 10 feet high with a footprint similar to that of the original bungalow, which is hardly modest.

2. No other Garage/Carport in in the locality is so close to the road, with such a large elevation and with a capacity for 6 or more vehicles.

3. Construction of the garage/car port started in 2018 and the partially erected car port is not even in accordance with an earlier application. Discrepancies between the report, drawings and Design Statement seem never to have been been reconciled.

4. The hedge, which was supposed to provide screening, but the owner is only obliged to maintain it for 5 years, after which the mass of the Garage/Carport would be fully exposed to the street scene.

5. The capacity for 6 or more vehicles is inconsistent with the needs of a domestic property and no change of use has ever been authorised. Some of the walls seem to be double skinned, while new pipework seems to have been connected to the foul drainage system, raising concerns about change of use.

6. There is clearly concern that 5 or 6 vehicles will be parked on site and their regular use would cause disproportionate wear to the road. If the property owner is prepared to contribute more to the annual road fund, then his proposal may be easier to accept.

Kind regards