Horsham District Council
Planning Services
Albery House
Springfield Road
Horsham
RH12 2GB

[redacted]

27 October 2026

Dear Sir/Madam,

PLANNING APPLICATION COMMENTS [REF DC/26/1594]

Introduction

I write as a local resident of Gorings Mead and a Chartered Town Planner. I previously objected to application DC/24/0048 and commented on the application for the 3G pitch, DC/22/2257. I continue to support the provision of sport and recreation facilities, provided that the use of the site is properly controlled and does not prejudice the amenity and safety of local residents.

I object to the removal of condition 3 of DC/24/0048. The information provided does not adequately demonstrate that the commercial parking use is acceptable on a permanent basis, particularly when considered alongside the wider use of the site. I also question whether the present application can properly be determined under section 73 following expiry of the temporary authorisation.

Basis of the original permission

Planning permission DC/24/0048 was granted on 17 December 2024. Condition 3 requires the use of the 50 spaces for private car parking for local businesses to cease on or before 17 June 2026.

The committee minutes of 3 December 2024[1], item PCN/13, page 2, record concerns about the width of the access road, existing difficulties exiting Gorings Mead onto Brighton Road and the impact of increased vehicle movements on residents. Members added the 18-month restriction and a requirement for a Car Park Monitoring and Management Plan through an alternative motion.

The minutes describe the temporary period as allowing the viability of the scheme to be monitored. The Council should explain how the evidence from that period addresses the concerns recorded by members and justifies permanent use.

Planning Practice Guidance, Use of planning conditions, paragraph 014 (reference 21a-014-20140306), states: "*There is no presumption that a temporary grant of planning permission will then be granted permanently*." The previous temporary permission should therefore not be treated as establishing the acceptability of permanent commercial parking.

[1] https://horsham.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=148&MId=2600

Monitoring and management

The supporting statement dated 22 October 2026 says that the entrance to Gorings Mead has been monitored, that traffic flow is unaffected and that the four companies using the facility have varied working patterns. However, the statement does not provide the underlying observations, survey dates, monitoring periods, vehicle counts, occupancy figures or details of queues and delays at the junction.

The Council should require the monitoring records, an explanation of the methodology and an assessment of whether the observations represent typical working days and full use of the 50 spaces. This should address both the morning and evening periods and the interaction with other activities at the site. West Sussex County Council should be asked to review the evidence and advise on permanent operation.

The applicant also states that a management plan has been submitted and implemented. Approval of a plan is not, in itself, evidence that it has operated effectively. The Council should identify the approved plan and consider the records of use, breaches and action taken under it.

The statement that no public objections at peak periods have been received or notified does not establish the absence of adverse effects. The Council should consider residents' representations and its own records alongside the monitoring evidence.

Cumulative impact with the 3G pitch

The original officer report expressly considered the interaction with the 3G pitch permission. Paragraphs 6.4–6.11 and 6.15–6.16 relied on the community use agreement required by condition 15 of DC/22/2257 to separate sports and community activity from peak business parking movements.

The current supporting statement does not explain whether the 3G pitch has been brought into use, the intensity of its operation during the temporary period or how the approved community use arrangements avoid conflict with business parking. The Council should establish these matters and consider the actual bookings, parking demand and arrival and departure patterns.

Residential amenity and the scope of permanent use

My previous objection raised the cumulative effect of weekday commercial parking followed by evening sports and community activity. Commercial parking extends vehicle movements through the residential road into periods when the car park was historically largely unused. The frequency and duration of activity are relevant, as well as the maximum number of vehicles present at any one time.

The Council should assess the resulting noise, disturbance, vehicle lights and effects on residents accessing their properties. Acceptability in terms of highway capacity or safety does not resolve these separate amenity considerations under Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework.

The permission is not restricted to the four businesses currently using the spaces or their present staffing arrangements. A permanent permission could accommodate different businesses and more concentrated arrivals and departures. The assessment must consider realistic operation of all 50 spaces within the permitted hours. Any arrangements essential to acceptability should be secured through precise and enforceable controls.

Expiry of the temporary period and validity of the application

Condition 3 required the commercial parking use to cease on or before 17 June 2026. The present supporting statement is dated 22 October 2026 and expressly identifies the proposal as a section 73 application to remove that condition. On the information available, the application appears to have been made after the temporary authorisation ended.

A relevant appeal decision is Land at Rose Meadow Farm, Wolverhampton Road, Prestwood, Stourbridge, reference APP/C3430/W/20/3262816, dated 16 February 2024. At paragraphs 2–5, the Inspector concluded that an application under section 73, made after the temporary permission had expired, was invalid. The Inspector considered that a full application engaging section 73A, with consideration of the planning merits, was appropriate in that case. That appeal raises a directly relevant procedural issue. Here, the commercial parking use was also authorised, which appears to have ended before the present application was made.

Before determining this application, the Council should explain the legal basis for proceeding under section 73 and why the approach taken in the Rose Meadow Farm appeal does not apply. It should establish whether a fresh full application under section 73A is required. If the Council considers that it can instead determine the existing submission under section 73A, it should explain that approach and ensure that the planning merits of permanent commercial parking are properly assessed, with an appropriate opportunity for residents to comment.

Conclusion

The information submitted does not adequately demonstrate that the committee's concerns have been resolved or that the commercial parking use can operate permanently without unacceptable effects on residents and conflict with sports and community use.

The procedural issue identified above should be resolved before any determination. If the Council concludes that the application can validly proceed, I request that permission be refused on the evidence currently provided. If further information is sought, the monitoring records and assessment of the combined uses should be made available for residents to comment before a decision is taken.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I would be grateful if the Council would give these matters due consideration.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]