[redacted]

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 21 November 2026 11:52
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/1312

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 21/11/2026 11:51 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	35 Churchill Avenue Horsham West Sussex RH12 2JP
Proposal:	Subdividing of existing plot and erection of a two storey, three bedroom dwelling. Demolition of garage and creation of vehicle access.
Case Officer:	Daniel Holmes

Click for further information

Customer Details

Address:	32 Churchill Avenue 32 Churchill Avenue 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 - Overdevelopment
Comments:	I object to this application, including the amended plans. I live at 32 Churchill Avenue, close to the site. 1. The harm found at appeal has not been addressed This is the fourth proposal for a house in this side garden. DC/25/1006 and DC/25/1668 were both refused, and the appeal against DC/25/1668 was dismissed on 18 June 2026 (Appeal 6002911). The Inspector found that the side garden contributes positively to the spacious character and visual relief at the end of the cul-de-sac, next to the recreation ground (para 4). The harm came from the subdivision of the plot, not only the size of the house. The host dwelling would be left with a noticeably reduced curtilage in a contrived plot arrangement (paras 5-8). The Inspector also found that even a smaller house would still read as a sizeable

detached dwelling (para 7).

The applicant's own documents show the essentials are unchanged:
- The plot split is identical: 301 m² for the new house and 182 m² for No. 35 (site plan PLN 12). These are the same figures the Council recorded for the dismissed scheme.
- The layout is the same: the gap to No. 35 is still about 2.0 m, and the rear element is of "broadly comparable depth" (Planning Statement, sections 5.3 and 13.2).
- The roof ignores the Council's advice: the applicant has declined the Council's pre-application advice (PE/26/0164) to use a hipped roof. The gable presents a full two-storey flank in views along the street and from the recreation ground.

Cutting the footprint from 98 m² to 65 m² makes the house narrower, but it still fills the open end of the street that the Inspector valued.

The applicant measures the scheme against the dismissed proposal, but the correct comparison is the site as it exists today: an open side garden that the Inspector found contributes positively to the character of the street.

A previous appeal decision on the same site is a material consideration. Like cases should be decided alike, and departing from an Inspector's reasoning needs clear reasons (North Wiltshire DC v SSE (1993) 65 P&CR 137). The proposal conflicts with HDPF Policies 25, 32 and 33, which the Inspector found consistent with national policy, and with Blueprint Neighbourhood Plan Policies HB3 and HB4.

2. The 2026 NPPF does not change the outcome

L2(1)(d) gives substantial weight to new homes in residential curtilages only where they are consistent with the overall street scene. None of its exceptions applies, and an Inspector has already found development on this plot inconsistent with the street scene.

S4(2)(a)(ii) indicates refusal where there is a substantial adverse impact in relation to those curtilage policies. DP3 requires refusal where a proposal fails to respond to its context without clear justification. Under Annex A, HDPF Policies 32 and 33 keep their weight.

The benefit is a single dwelling. The Inspector gave that only moderate weight, even allowing for the housing shortfall.

3. Access and parking at the entrance to the recreation ground

The revised layout puts two new crossovers and four parking spaces within the turning head. The Highway Authority's response (29 September 2026) says the turning head is mainly for emergency, delivery and refuse vehicles to turn. It also says the footway in front of the site leads to the recreation ground, which is why it asks for pedestrian visibility splays.

This footway is the pedestrian route into the recreation ground behind Greenway School, about 150 m away. At school drop-off and pick-up times (roughly 8:00-8:45 and 15:00-15:45), it is busy with very young children walking, running and scooting, often a few metres ahead of their parents. I regularly see at least 20 families using it in that window. A driver leaving either new driveway, particularly if reversing, would have very limited sight of a small child on the footway past the frontage wall and planting, at exactly the point where children enter the recreation ground.

The Highway Authority made no site visit and relied on recorded injury collisions, which do not capture near misses. It also said parking pressure here is an amenity matter for the Council to judge:
- The new crossovers would remove kerbside space at the end of the cul-de-sac.
- No. 35 would have one space, against the two the County's parking calculator indicates.
- The County's own crossover criteria say crossings over grass verges will most likely be refused. The site plan shows exactly that, so the off-street parking may not be deliverable at all.

Displaced cars would end up in the turning head. This conflicts with NPPF TR4 (priority for

walking, minimising conflict between pedestrians and vehicles, and access for service and emergency vehicles), HDPF Policies 33, 40 and 41, and Blueprint Policy HB4. At the very least, the Council should require a swept-path analysis, and the visibility splays shown on plan, before deciding.

4. Request

Please refuse the application because:
- The subdivision and new dwelling would be cramped and contrived, and would erode the spacious character at the end of Churchill Avenue. This is contrary to HDPF Policies 25, 32 and 33, Blueprint Policies HB3 and HB4, and NPPF DP3 and L2(1)(d)(i), and consistent with Appeal Decision 6002911.
- The access and parking arrangements would increase conflict with pedestrians, including children, at the entrance to the recreation ground, and would add to parking pressure in the turning head. This is contrary to HDPF Policies 33, 40 and 41, Blueprint Policy HB4 and NPPF TR4.

Given the history and the level of local concern, I ask that the application be decided by the Planning Committee. If the Council is minded to approve, conditions should secure:

- the visibility splays
- a swept-path-tested layout
- protection of the off-site oak
- a bin collection point clear of the footway
- a construction plan that keeps the turning head clear

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

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