

WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL CONSULTATION

TO:	Mid Sussex District Council FAO: Jessica Szollosi
FROM:	WSCC – Highways Authority
DATE:	8 September 2026
LOCATION:	70 Sycamore Drive East Grinstead RH19 3UL
SUBJECT:	DM/26/1215 Retrospective application for erection of a shed which partially covers owned car parking spaces. (Updated plans received on 17/08/2026).
DATE OF SITE VISIT:	n/a
RECOMMENDATION:	Advice

I refer to your consultation in respect of the above planning application and would provide the following comments.

The proposal seeks retrospective permission for the erection of a shed on land to the rear of 70 Sycamore Drive. The shed overlaps hardstanding intended as a parking provision for the property in a private shared parking area. The parking is accessed to the southwest of the property and serves parking for a number of other properties.

The most recently submitted drawing shows approx. 4.6m x 4.4m remaining to the rear of the shed to accommodate parking.

WSCC parking standards outline that 2.4m x 4.8m is sufficient space to facilitate parking for an average size vehicle. It is considered therefore that some vehicles may overhang the property boundary onto the shared access route, when in use.

Photographs have been provided which show two vehicles parked in front of the shed. It remains unclear whether this has an impact on the ability for adjoining homeowners to gain entry to or manoeuvre from their allocated parking spaces however, as it is noted that there is the presence of parked vehicles on both sides of the parking area at this point.

The Local Highway Authority (LHA) is mindful that there has been the presence of a shed in this location, for some time. Although historic aerial photography shows that the previous shed was oriented to one side, which would have allowed one of the full-length parking spaces to be retained. There is a consideration that this practise has been in operation historically with no known highway safety concerns registered. There have been no recorded highway collisions within the vicinity of the access to flag a concern with the current practises.

If a vehicle was unable to park at this location due to its length, it is considered that alternative provisions, namely on-street parking, would need to be sought by the homeowner. The LHA is unaware of any existing parking pressures in this location, however, matters of amenity are for the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to consider.

The number of bedrooms within no. 70 has not been identified alongside this application, and therefore it has not been possible to establish the parking demand generated by this property.

The LHA does not consider that if the two vehicle spaces were unusable, having two vehicles dispersed onto the highway in this location would cause a material change over the current practises in Sycamore Drive and adjoining roads. The Planning Authority may however wish to consider the proposal from an amenity perspective.

The Local Highway Authority does not consider that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 116), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

Jodie Wilkes
West Sussex County Council – Planning Services