[redacted]

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 26 October 2026 19:01
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0781

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 26/10/2026 7:01 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	3 Station Road Billingshurst West Sussex RH14 9RF
Proposal:	Erection of a new dwelling.
Case Officer:	Bethan Tinning

Click for further information

Customer Details

Address:	Groom Cottage 7 - 9 Station Road Billingshurst West Sussex

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Highway Access and Parking - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise - Trees and Landscaping
Comments:	Objection to planning application DC/26/0781 3 Station Road, Billingshurst, West Sussex RH14 9RF To: Bethan Tinning, Development Management, Horsham District Council Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk From: [redacted] - Groom Cottage, 7-9 Station Road Date: 19th October 2026 Dear Ms Tinning, I object to the application for a new dwelling at 3 Station Road. I am writing with particular concern about Groom Cottage, 7-9 Station Road, owned by me, [redacted], and the shared access serving neighbouring properties. My comments distinguish the current proposal from the refused application DC/25/1946 and identify matters requiring correction, assessment or mitigation. 1. Description and assessment conflict with the submitted drawings The WPS Planning Statement, project 115/2026, dated April 2026, repeatedly describes an entirely single-storey dwelling. Paragraph 6.15 specifically relies on the absence of first-floor

accommodation to conclude that the primary source of overlooking has been removed. Paragraph 7.3 similarly relies on the removal of all first-floor overlooking.
However, drawing 115/2026/3, Proposed Elevations and Floor Plan, expressly includes a floor labelled "first floor", an internal staircase and two dormer windows. The application form, page 10, proposes one two-bedroom dwelling. Whether the design is described as a chalet bungalow or otherwise, it plainly includes accommodation above ground-floor level.
This is material to the assessment, not simply terminology: a central justification for overcoming the previous amenity refusal does not reflect the submitted drawing. Please require a corrected statement and an assessment of the actual height, massing, upper-floor accommodation and window sightlines. The scheme should not be assessed on the premise that it has no first-floor accommodation.
2. Shared driveway: application boundary and ownership certification
Drawing 115/2026/1, Site and Location Plan, appears to include the shared driveway/access to Station Road within the red application boundary. The current application form, page 14, contains Certificate A completed by the agent, Doug Wright, with an ownership declaration date of the 30th April 2026.
The Land Registry register for 3 Station Road, title SX94628, Property Register entry A3 (page 2 of the supplied January 2026 copy), records the benefit of a right of way "with or without vehicles over and along the roadway coloured brown", granted by the transfer dated the 22nd September 1967 between [redacted] and [redacted].
It includes contributions according to use towards repairs and maintenance, and identifies the roadway as tinted brown on the filed plan.
Groom Cottage, 7-9 Station Road, title SX134713, Charges Register entry C7 (page 5), records the burden of the same right granted by the same transfer, identifying the roadway as hatched brown on its filed plan. These matching entries strongly suggest that the relevant shared roadway falls within Groom Cottage's title, subject to access rights benefiting 3 Station Road, rather than being wholly owned within the applicant's title.
I recognise that an application boundary can properly include third-party land required for access. My concern is the accuracy of Certificate A in those circumstances. Please check the current title position and precise extent of the application site against the attached title documents, and require the appropriate certificate and notices to other owners if necessary before determination.
I am not asking the Council to determine a private boundary or easement dispute, nor asserting that the quoted grant expressly limits access to one dwelling. Private rights are reserved separately. The practical operation of the proposed access and parking should nevertheless be clearly shown.
3. Parking and access must be demonstrated for both dwellings
The new application would retain the existing house and add one two-bedroom dwelling, leaving two dwellings on the site. Page 8 of the application form records four existing and four proposed car spaces, with no numerical increase. The site layout, drawing 115/2026/2 in the file dated the 3rd July 2026, shows four apparent bays but does not identify their allocation between the existing and proposed dwellings.
Paragraph 4.12 of the Planning Statement says no alterations to the access are proposed, whereas page 7 of the application form answers "Yes" to a new or altered vehicle access. Please reconcile these statements and identify precisely what physical works and access arrangements are proposed.
I acknowledge that West Sussex County Council raised no highway objection to DC/25/1946 in its response of the 4th February 2026. I do not suggest otherwise or rely on the earlier pre-application parking figures. This revised layout needs its own assessment, taking account of the retained house and the continuing use of the shared driveway by neighbouring properties. Please require a parking calculation for both dwellings, confirming the existing house's bedroom count and whether bays are allocated or shared. A dimensioned layout and proportionate vehicle-tracking evidence should show how each bay can be used with the others occupied, the clear route retained for neighbours, pedestrian movement, and practical refuse, delivery and emergency-access arrangements. Any manoeuvring outside the applicant's title should be identified rather than treated as unrestricted space.
4. Relationship with the retained house, gardens and neighbouring amenity
The proposed layout places the new dwelling close to the retained house. The submitted elevations include upper-floor dormers, but the site plan does not clearly identify the existing house's relevant windows, separation dimensions, the division of private gardens, or the access routes serving each dwelling.
Please require a coordinated, dimensioned layout showing these relationships and the position,

height and outlook of the proposed windows, with sections or sightlines where needed. It should demonstrate that both dwellings retain usable private outdoor space and that overlooking, enclosure, daylight and disturbance are acceptable for existing and future occupiers. Boundary screening should not be assumed to remedy upper-floor overlooking without examination.

The assessment should also consider noise, headlights and pedestrian/vehicle conflict associated with the parking and shared access beside neighbouring homes, including Groom Cottage. I do not assert unmeasured separation distances or that the smaller proposal necessarily reproduces all the harms of the refused scheme.

5. Protected trees and ecological assessment

The delegated report for DC/25/1946, page 5, and the Council's tree consultation responses of 3 and 18 February 2026 identify the protected ash as a central concern. The tree officer required a realistically offset root protection area, reflecting the constraint of Station Road, with new development outside that area and an appropriate working buffer. The objection was maintained after the earlier tree information was revised.

The new Tree Protection Plan, drawing 115/2026-4, and Planning Statement paragraphs 6.24-6.27 claim that the revised development avoids the retained trees' root protection areas. Please obtain an arboricultural assessment of the current layout, including foundations, working space, fencing, services, paths, parking surfaces and construction movements, rather than considering only whether the building outline falls outside a marked area. I am not asserting that the new footprint has been proved to encroach.

Retaining the existing house is a significant change which may address the previous concern associated with demolition of a building having moderate bat-roost potential. However, the previous ecology response from Place Services, dated the 20th February 2026, reference 13527, also identified potential bat-roost features in trees T1 and T2 and a need to address lighting effects. The current form, page 7, says tree or hedge removal/pruning is required, while the Planning Statement, paragraphs 6.31-6.33, asserts no risk of disturbance and no remaining pathway for harm.

Please clarify the exact tree works and obtain proportionate ecological advice confirming whether the revised works, lighting and vegetation changes affect bats or their habitat, and what evidence or mitigation is necessary. I am not seeking surveys automatically where a suitably supported assessment demonstrates that they are unnecessary.

6. Drainage and wastewater capacity

Southern Water's response to this application, dated the 12th October 2026, reference DSA000058203, identifies insufficient drainage information and requests approval of foul and surface-water drainage details before construction. It also identifies a potential minor increase in risk to the sewer network and requests occupation to align with delivery of any required network reinforcement. Southern Water expressly states that it does not object on network-capacity grounds.

Please resolve any drainage issue affecting the acceptability of the layout before determination and secure the requested drainage and occupation controls if permission is granted. The current application form, page 8, leaves the surface-water disposal options unselected. The scheme should identify its drainage route, discharge arrangements and any necessary long-term maintenance, coordinated with tree protection and the shared access. I do not present Southern Water's response as an outright objection.

7. Construction management and overall request

Given the shared access, please secure a proportionate construction-management plan before works begin, covering delivery and unloading arrangements, contractor parking, materials storage, pedestrian safety, working hours, ground protection and continued access to neighbouring properties.

I ask the Council not to approve the scheme on the basis of an inaccurate single-storey assessment or unresolved access, layout and technical information. Please require the application documents to be reconciled and assess the actual design against the previous refusal reasons. If unacceptable harm remains, I request refusal; otherwise, material changes and necessary safeguards should be secured before permission or by appropriate conditions, as applicable. The ownership-certificate issue should be resolved through the proper notice and certification process.

Please treat this as my representation on DC/26/0781, acknowledge receipt, and notify me of any material amendments and opportunity to comment. I would welcome a site inspection focused on the relationship between the parking arrangement, shared driveway, retained house and proposed dwelling.

Yours sincerely,

[redacted]

Supporting title documents: January 2026 register copies and title plans for SX94628 and SX134713. Other references above identify documents in the two planning application files.

Kind regards

Telephone:
Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk

Horsham District Council

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