
From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 18 May 2026 11:29
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0616

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 18/05/2026 11:29 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	82 Bedford Road Horsham West Sussex RH13 5BH
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey rear extension.
Case Officer:	Meg Bayliss

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	14 Bedford Road Horsham
----------	-------------------------

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:

Dear Planning Officer,

I wish to formally object to the proposed development at 82 Bedford Road, Horsham, RH13 5BH on the following planning grounds.

Design, Appearance, Materials and Character

The proposed extension would occupy an excessive proportion of the garden when compared with neighbouring properties. It extends significantly further than other extensions within the road, despite the smaller plot size resulting from the rear alley access. The scale, bulk and massing are therefore out of keeping with the established character, spacing and pattern of surrounding Victorian terraced properties.

In relation to the partially constructed extension nearest to No. 84, the materials currently used do not appear sympathetic to either the existing property or the wider streetscene and are not considered to be of a sufficiently high standard. The submitted plans state that the extension will match the existing redwood brickwork; however, what has actually been constructed is grey block-work. It does not appear possible to overlay red brickwork because construction has been built directly up to the party wall adjacent to the alley. Consequently, the brickwork would need to be altered entirely. Please see attached photographs.

Additionally, the previous extension dating from the 1970s has been largely demolished and will therefore require rebuilding in a manner consistent with the surrounding area. The wall adjoining No. 84 Bedford Road has been completely demolished, which raises safety concerns. The submitted plans are therefore misleading in their current form. Please see attached photographs.

The proposal represents an over-intensive form of development for a small Victorian terraced property and plot.

I have also identified what appears to be a fundamental flaw within the submitted drawings, which may have the effect of misleading the planning authority. The side passage is unregistered land intended to provide access to all three properties. Furthermore, the rear section of the alley is owned by No. 80, and I attach supporting evidence from the Land Registry.

The proposed development plans appear to include land outside the applicant's ownership or control, which may distort the apparent square footage and overall site coverage calculations. I understand that site boundaries, area measurements and site coverage should be shown clearly and accurately; however, this does not appear to have been properly addressed. The boundary is shown correctly on the existing OS map and location plan, but not on the proposed OS map and location plan, which gives the impression that additional land has suddenly been acquired.

The significant loss of garden space would also be out of keeping with the character and amenity expectations of neighbouring family homes.

Furthermore, the proposed layout would provide an extremely poor standard of living accommodation, with no natural light within the only shared living space, namely the kitchen, and virtually no outside amenity space due to the proposal building over almost the entire garden.

Highway Safety, Traffic and Parking

The application significantly underestimates the likely impact on parking demand. A six-bedroom HMO could reasonably generate multiple vehicles, particularly given the number of occupants proposed.

The property is located close to the junction of New Street and Bedford Road, where there are already existing parking and obstruction issues. Additional parking pressure could worsen congestion, restrict visibility and create further highway safety concerns.

Noise, Disturbance and Smells

The number of proposed occupants raises concerns regarding increased noise and general disturbance to neighbouring properties due to the intensity of use.

There are also concerns that intensified occupation, together with the addition of multiple en-suite bathrooms connected to the existing Victorian drainage infrastructure, could result in drainage problems, unpleasant odours and sewage surcharging affecting neighbouring properties.

The plans do not clearly demonstrate adequate kitchen extraction or ventilation arrangements, raising concerns regarding cooking odours and ventilation.

There are also significant concerns regarding fire safety and means of escape. The kitchen has no windows or external doors. In addition, because HMO occupants are from multiple households, it is likely that bedroom doors will be locked. In practice, the two rear ground-floor bedrooms would therefore prevent escape via the rear from the kitchen area. If a fire occurred between the kitchen and the front entrance, escape may not be possible. No accessible secondary escape route currently appears to be provided.

Overshadowing and Loss of Light

The scale and depth of the proposed rear extension would result in overshadowing and loss of natural light to neighbouring properties, including a reduction of light to my kitchen.

Drainage

The extent of development over a substantial proportion of the rear garden raises concerns regarding surface water drainage and increased runoff, potentially affecting neighbouring properties.

Planning Compliance and Accuracy of Plans

Works appear to have commenced before planning permission has been granted.

The side-return extension may exceed permitted development limitations, including the three-metre depth restriction, and should therefore be properly assessed as part of the application. In addition, the brickwork currently constructed does not match the existing Victorian structure and is out of keeping with the character of the property.

There also appear to be inconsistencies within the submitted plans regarding the chimney flue, which is shown as existing at roof level despite indications that the chimney breasts have been removed.

The proposed kitchen is located beneath a bedroom and appears to have no windows, doors or clearly identified ventilation route.

The application also fails to clearly demonstrate adequate external storage provision for refuse bins, recycling facilities or bicycle storage associated with a large HMO occupancy.

Finally, the plans appear to provide inadequate communal living and storage space relative to the number of occupants proposed.

For the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request that the application be refused.

Yours faithfully,



Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



