

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 24 May 2026 11:54
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 24/05/2026 11:54 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:	84 Bedford Road Horsham West Sussex
----------	-------------------------------------

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 - Privacy Light and Noise
----------------------	---

Comments:	Relevant Planning Considerations
-----------	----------------------------------

Design, Appearance, Materials & Character

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

* Regarding the design and appearance of the partially constructed extension nearest to 84: the materials used do not appear sympathetic to the existing property or wider streetscene and are not considered to be of a sufficiently high standard. The plans say they will match existing redwood brickwork, however what has been built is in grey block-work. It is not possible to overlay red bricks as they have built right up to the party wall adjacent to the alley. Therefore

the brickwork would need to be changed. See photo. Additionally, the previous extension from the 1970s has been mainly demolished so this will need re building in keeping with the area. The wall is completely demolished on the side of 84 Bedford Road and raises a safety concern. The plans are therefore misleading. See photo.

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

* I have identified what appears to be a fundamental flaw within the submitted drawings, which I believe may have the effect of misleading the planning team. The side passage is shared land intended to provide access to all three properties. Additionally, the rear section of the alley is owned by No. 80, and I attach evidence of this from the Land Registry. The proposed development plans submitted by the applicant appear to include land outside the applicant's ownership/control, which may distort the apparent square footage and site coverage. Area and site coverage details I understand should be clearly and accurately shown, but this does not appear to have been properly addressed. On the existing OS map and location plan the boundary is correct, but not on the proposed OS map and location plan. It makes it look as if they have suddenly acquired land!

* The significant loss of garden space is out of keeping with the character and amenity expectations of neighbouring family homes.

* The plans would give an extremely low standard of living with no natural light in the only shared living space, the kitchen, and no outside living space as the plans are to build over almost the entire garden.



Highway Safety, Traffic & Parking

* The application significantly underestimates the impact on parking demand. A 6-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 problems. Additional parking pressure could worsen congestion, restrict visibility and create further highway safety concerns.



Noise, Disturbance & 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 concerns that intensified occupation and the addition of multiple en-suite bathrooms connected to existing Victorian drainage infrastructure could result in drainage problems, smells and sewage surcharging affecting neighbouring properties.

* The plans do not clearly demonstrate adequate kitchen extraction and ventilation arrangements, raising concerns regarding cooking odours and ventilation. There is a significant problem with planning for adequate fire exits. The kitchen has no windows or doors. Additionally as occupants of HMOs are from multiple households doors to the bedrooms will be locked. In an HMO the 2 ground-floor rear bedrooms would be locked so exiting via the rear from the kitchen is not an option. If a fire occurs between the door leading to the front of the house escape is not possible. No accessible second exit route is currently planned.

* This situation has now been ongoing for nearly a year. In September, tenants were moved into the property despite the existence of a historical improvement notice. Other than the service of party wall notices, neighbouring residents have received no communication from the owners throughout the process. The approved inspector/building control company, Dunwoody, has declined to engage with neighbouring residents despite serious concerns regarding the standard of the works. The development has caused significant and ongoing disruption, and stress and anxiety to neighbouring occupiers (including sleepless nights for me). The prolonged building disturbance has so far been five months. The works appear to have been unnecessarily extended due to repeated failures to follow the correct legal and planning processes. There has also been a constant turnover of unknown contractors attending the site, and on one occasion I experienced behaviour from an individual connected to the works which I found intimidating, leading me to call the police. The door of number [REDACTED] was also kicked in at

four in the morning when works first began and the police were called out by another neighbour. This proposal represents a substantial intensification of use, changing what was historically a family home (albeit later divided into two flats) into an overdeveloped, high-intensity occupation site that is entirely out of keeping with the character and capacity of the surrounding residential area.

3M

Overshadowing & Loss of Light

* The scale and depth of the rear extension would cause overshadowing and loss of natural light to neighbouring properties, including reduced light to my kitchen.

3M

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.

3M

Planning Compliance / Accuracy of Plans

- * Works have commenced before planning permission has been granted
 - * Works have commenced and foundations fully built potentially directly over a shared sewer. The 150 mm diameter gravity sewer requires a clearance of 3 metres on either side of the gravity sewer to protect it from construction works and to allow for future maintenance access. No development or tree planting should be carried out within 3 metres of the external edge of the public gravity sewer without consent from Southern Water. All existing infrastructure should be protected during the course of construction work. None of this has happened. In addition they have plumbed in 6 en suites into unsuitable Victorian drains.
 - * The side-return extension exceeds permitted development limitations, including the 3 metre depth restriction, and should therefore be properly assessed as part of the application. The brickwork does not match and is out of keeping with the existing Victorian structure. According to the drawings, the extension on the side return also breaches the 3m height rule. Planning officers I understand should assess from the highest adjoining ground level, not from lowered patios or excavated land. This infill on an Edwardian terrace is dominant, blocks light into the kitchen of number 80 and completely blocks the outlook. The build quality is extremely poor. From looking at other neighbours properties it seems none of them have extended over the side return.
 - * There 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 kitchen is below a bedroom and has no windows or doors and no clear ventilation route.
 - * Regarding Room 2 Floor to Ceiling. HDC's HMO Standards, for all HMO rooms 2.4m floor to ceiling is required. Room 3 in the new extension looks to be well under 2.4m too despite claiming it is 2.52m The applicant has provided incorrect and misleading information by stating the ceiling height in both Room 2 and Room 3 is 2.52m. Room 4 is also below the HMO ceiling height standard of 2.4m. It's stated as 2263mm
 - * The application does not clearly demonstrate adequate external storage space for refuse bins, recycling or bicycles associated with a large HMO occupancy.
 - * The plans also appear to provide inadequate communal living/storage space relative to the number of occupants proposed.
 - * Finally given the amount of inaccuracies on these plans versus what has been built in reality, I highly recommend that both planning compliance and the HMO licensing team make a site visit. Southern water needs to be involved too.
-

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



**Horsham
District
Council**

Horsham District Council, Alberty House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB

Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton