

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 24 June 2026 10:33:45 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
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 24/06/2026 10:33 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	82 Bedford Road Horsham West Sussex RH13 5BH
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey rear extension (Part Retrospective)
Case Officer:	Meg Bayliss

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	84 Bedford Road Horsham
----------	-------------------------

Comments Details

Comme nter Type:	Neighbour
------------------------	-----------

Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
---------	--

Reason s for comme nt:	- Design - Highway Access and Parking - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
---------------------------------	---

Comme nts:	I am writing regarding the consultation response on fire escapes and the revised layout submitted for this application, as well as providing comment on parking arrangements and Southern Water's response.
---------------	---

I refer to my previous objection letter which can be found here
https://iawpa.horsham.gov.uk/PublicAccess_Live/Document/ViewDocument?id=F0EDB1

040D7B45A881D639FD9A1E096D Please read this letter in conjunction with my previous letter on the planning portal dated 24 May.

Please note that I strongly object to the proposed plans. Although this application relates to a single-storey bedroom extension, its apparent simplicity masks a number of interconnected planning issues. While each issue may seem limited when considered in isolation, their combined impact is significant and, taken together, presents a strong case for refusal. I therefore ask that the application is assessed as a whole, with proper regard to the cumulative effect of all relevant considerations.

1. Fire escape route

Environmental Health has suggested a separate escape corridor, which appears to be reflected in the revised plans. However, it is not clear how this modification has been assessed against Horsham District Council's HMO standards for a six-person occupation, particularly as the kitchen/diner appears to be the sole communal space available to occupiers.

The revised layout appears to result in a further reduction in usable communal floor space. In particular:

- The plans appear to show only five seats despite the proposal being for six occupiers.
- There does not appear to be a dining table or suitable dining area.
- The revised plans do not appear to show any clothes washing facilities.
- The bedrooms are extremely compact due to the inclusion of en-suite facilities and double beds, increasing the importance of adequate communal space.
- The kitchen/diner has absolutely no natural light or clear ventilation.

In some respects, the revised proposal appears less satisfactory than the previous layout because the introduction of the escape corridor further reduces the available communal living space.

I would therefore welcome clarification on:

1. Whether the revised kitchen/diner has been assessed against the minimum standards applicable to a six-person HMO.
2. Whether the room remains capable of functioning as an adequate communal space for six occupiers.
3. How the lack of natural light and ventilation has been considered.
4. Whether the absence of a dedicated dining area and apparent shortage of seating has been assessed.
5. Whether the omission of laundry facilities from the revised plans has been considered.

I would also welcome clarification regarding the Environmental Health recommendation for roller-catch doors. It is unclear how this arrangement would balance fire safety requirements with occupiers' legitimate needs for privacy and security within an HMO setting. In reality, this bedroom door in the proposed extension will be locked, and so will the other rear bedroom door, effectively trapping residents should a fire occur at the front of the house. I want this on record that should this be approved, HDC is approving a plan that is fundamentally unsafe.

Taken together, these issues raise concerns about the overall practicality and quality of

the accommodation proposed. It would be helpful to understand whether these matters have been considered cumulatively, rather than in isolation, when assessing the acceptability of the bedroom extension and associated HMO layout.

In addition, Environmental Health's response states that "a safe escape route must also be provided and maintained, with a paved (or similar) continuous surface with emergency lighting". If this requirement relates to the shared alleyway (as well as the garden), it should be noted that the applicant does not have unilateral rights to pave or alter that access route, as it is a shared alleyway and any such works would require the consent of the affected owners (84 and 80).

Furthermore, the condition of the alleyway has been significantly affected by construction traffic associated with the development. I have already raised this matter through my Party Wall Surveyor and maintain that any damage caused should be repaired at the applicant's expense. I have had no response to this complaint.

The Environmental Health officer's original concern appears to have been addressed by reducing communal space, which potentially creates a different accommodation-standard issue.

2. Parking considerations.

WSCC Highways department has submitted a response but the metrics they have used are incorrect. Their conclusion is that there would be no impact on local parking. They mention that the existing house was 2 x 2-bedroom flats. This is incorrect - they were both single-occupier 1-bedroom flats. Please see the Rightmove listing here.: <https://www.rightmove.co.uk/properties/163497110>

Please can you therefore go back to WSCC and ask them to review their response.

Additionally, you can see that these previous flats offered a much better quality of living space - each flat had a bedroom, kitchen and separate living room.

WSCC say that a condition of planning approval is the need to show drawings with covered and secure cycle parking. Even without the proposed new extension, I question whether the tiny garden has space for a paved fire escape route, a bike shed, and a large collection of bins for multiple occupants! Let alone any proper outside living space.

3. Southern water

Lastly, Southern Water has commented on the revised plan. However, it still appears that they are unaware that one extension has already been built, and another partially constructed, without the required permission or drawings. Additionally, it should be noted that the rear extension goes much further back than the manhole in the shared alley, which means in all likelihood, they have built straight over the shared sewer.

Please can HDC go back to Southern Water and clarify this. I am concerned as this sewer serves this entire side of the street, and we could at any point have a sewage discharge. This is before the six en suites they've plumbed into fragile Victorian drains are operational!

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