From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 18 November 2024 07:38:05 UTC+00:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/24/1642
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 18/11/2024 7:38 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	64 Blackbridge Lane Horsham West Sussex RH12 1RX
Proposal:	Erection of a two storey front extension.
Case Officer:	Meg Bayliss

Click for further information

Customer Details

Address:	62 Blackbridge Lane Horsham

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking
Comments:	Dear Planning Officer, With reference to the revised plans dated 14/11/2024, I would like to highlight significant concerns regarding the proposed parking arrangements at the property in question. The area indicated as parking down the side of the house is not viable in practice and reflects a fundamental misunderstanding by those not currently residing at the property. The shared driveway between the two adjacent properties is only

single-car width with a single dropped curb. While it may be theoretically possible to park two cars in tandem, this arrangement is impractical.

The driveway does not provide adequate width for two cars side by side, making it impossible for occupants to open their car doors without encroaching on the boundary or obstructing the access of others. This has been demonstrated, and photographic evidence can be provided upon request.

Historically, these driveways were designed solely as access points to rear garages, which have since been removed or repurposed by most residents to extend garden space. The current structure at 64 Blackbridge Lane illustrates the original design. Therefore, these driveways were never intended as dedicated parking spaces and were not built to accommodate modern vehicle sizes.

It is understood among residents that these shared driveways are used solely for access. Parking in these narrow spaces would not only cause significant inconvenience and friction among neighbors but would also violate boundary guidelines as stated in property deeds. The plans show cars positioned up to the boundary line, leaving insufficient space for functional use. Should residents at 66 attempt to use their designated side, it would effectively render the other half of the driveway unusable.

The proposed tandem parking layout fails to consider the dimensions of modern vehicles. With cars stacked front to back, the rear car would block driveway access for the neighboring property at 66, restricting their ability to exit. Again, this can be substantiated with photographic evidence if required.

I respectfully request that a site visit by the planning officer be conducted to observe these practical limitations firsthand. Such a visit would make clear the implausibility of these parking arrangements and highlight the disconnect between the proposed plans and the reality of living at this address.

Thank you for considering these objections.

Kind regards