From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 25 June 2025 10:49:18 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/25/0761
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 25/06/2025 10:49 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	39 Carfax Horsham West Sussex RH12 1EQ
Proposal:	Erection of a two storey building for B2/B8 Use (General industrial/Storage or distribution).
Case Officer:	Hannah Darley

Click for further information

Customer Details

Address:	40 Carfax Horsham

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Other - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	We object to the proposed development for the following reasons: 1. Proposed Use Classes a. The application 'Headline' description on the HDC letter and

HDC portal mentions only use classes B2 and B8.

b. The 'Planning Statement' is titled "Erection of two storey buildings for B2, B8 and E use". Use class E is also mentioned in paras 1.1, 4.1 and 6.1

c. The 'Planning & Heritage Statement' is also titled "Erection of two storey buildings for B2, B8 and E use". Use class E is also mentioned in paras 1.1, 4.1 and 6.1

d. The application and accompanying documents are therefore contradictory and potentially invalid.

e. Approval for use class E would be entirely inappropriate for this 'enclosed' location, due to potential impact on neighbouring residential properties and access/egress limitations and the wide range of potential activities covered by class E.

f. B2 General industrial use is not suitable for residential areas and there are apartments in the surrounding buildings. There is a reason that B1 is a separate use class.

2. Impact on Neighbour Amenity

a. Loss of light/overshadowing for neighbouring buildings 40-52 Carfax some of which would face directly out onto a new 2-storey brick wall.

b. Para 6.18 of the 'Planning Statement' states that:

i. "The majority of the neighbouring building consist of commercial premises, although there is some residential use within the building within the centre of the Carfax, however given that the residential use has been a recent introduction alongside the existing commercial and town centre use. It not considered that the additional of two small units would cause any harm to the occupants of nearby residential use".

c. Para 6.23 of the 'Planning & Heritage Statement' states that:

i. "The majority of the neighbouring building consist of commercial premises, although there is some residential use within the building within the centre of the Carfax, however given that the residential use has been a recent introduction alongside the existing commercial and town centre use. It not considered that the additional of two small units would cause any harm to the occupants of nearby residential use".

d. The grammar is poor in both documents and implies that 'recent' timing of when residential use began is relevant. It is not. Residents are living there now and will be impacted by the development.

3. Poor Design

a. Poor urban design in the Horsham primary retail centre, ignoring local vernacular with a plain brick wall and no architectural features, white uPVC windows of a design that ignores the surrounding sash windows design and materials - policy 12 and Horsham Conservation Area Appraisal.

4. Poor Access

a. No parking or unloading facilities for storage and distribution business use - policy 41

b. Proposal is poorly accessible and is not well-connected to the existing defined frontage - policy 13.

5. Application Form Issues

a. Page 5: 'Existing Use'

i. The applicant states "vacant land at rear of commercial buildings'.
ii. This is only partially correct and misleading, as No 39 also has residential flats above on the upper floors above the ground floor retail unit, as do other neighbouring premises.

b. Page 8: "Foul Sewage"

i. Method of disposal and connection to existing drainage system are both ticked as 'unknown'. Is the current drainage provision in the area sufficient to support two new business units, especially as their potential activities under classes B2, B8 and E, could be wide ranging?

c. Page 8 : "Trade Effluent"

i. 'No' is ticked regarding the need to dispose of trade waste.
ii. This must be incorrect. Any business operating from the new premises will certainly produce trade waste.
iii. If operating as 'distribution', or 'general industrial' then packaging/cardboard etc is highly likely to be produced (We can't think of a business model that would not produce trade waste).

d. Page 10: "Hours of Opening"

i. The box has been ticked 'No'.
ii. However, these hours of operation ARE highly relevant to the surrounding residential properties and also the existing retail commercial properties, depending on the specific nature of activities that could take place under Class B2, B8 or E, for which approval is being sought.

More generally, it does seem to be a gross 'overdevelopment' of a tiny ex-garden site.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



Horsham District Council
