

Rachel Richardson

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 October 2025 18:30
To: Rachel Richardson
Subject: DM/25/2253 House in rear of 2 Keymer Road - Objections
Attachments: Attachment A.pdf; Attachment C.pdf; Attachment B.pdf; Attachment D.pdf

Objections Key points -

**Attention of Rachel Richardson from [REDACTED] 23 Clayton Ave
Hassocks BN6 8HD**

Planning application DM/25/2253 House in rear of 2 Keymer Road

Key points for objection to:

Policy

The proposed application is overbearing and unneighbourly, does not respect the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape and is therefore contrary to 'Policy DP26: Character and Design of the District Plan' and 'Policy 9: Character and Design of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan'.

Overdevelopment and Scale

The current proposal significantly deviates from the previously approved scheme for a single-storey dwelling. The new design comprises a two-storey structure reaching over 5.7 metres in height on the elevation directly adjacent to our boundary, separated only by a low 1.8m timber fence. The existing approved design may have a similar roof line but the surface area and impact on each elevation is considerably significant. For example, in the South, the elevation was 28.5 sqm and has since increased to 54.6sqm facing our property.

This is a considerable increase in scale and massing. Furthermore, the internal layout now includes a ground floor office with en-suite facilities, creating the realistic potential for the property to function as a 3-bedroom home, despite being previously approved as a 1-bedroom dwelling for a relatively small site.

See 'Attachment A' showing the difference in the South elevation between the approved scheme DM/23/3181 and the new application DM25/2253.

See 'Attachment B' that shows the impression of the new proposal DM25/2253 and the approved scheme DM/23/3181 from the garden of No. 23 Clayton Avenue.

Loss of Privacy

The 2-storey design promotes occupation upon an elevated balcony that is very much higher than our boundary fence to capitalise upon the views towards the South Downs. This is a shared terrace which relies upon the good maintenance of the timber slats being utilised for the screening. As a material that degrades over time, there is no enforcement to upkeep this screening as a permanent feature, not to mention that it still allows a direct line of sight and noise due to the semi-open design.

See ‘Attachment C’ showing the probable views and distances from the balcony to neighbouring gardens, patios and houses.

Visual Impact and Inappropriate Design

The proposal is visually incongruous and poorly designed in relation to its immediate context. The design precedents reference timber and brick buildings in natural tones, in addition to part-rendered Victorian and 20th century properties with pitched roofs. This design is predominantly a cheaper white render, particularly towards our boundary, in an extensive area of greenery and mature trees. The previous application utilised a clay pitched roof which would have weathered and blended into this natural setting. This new proposal is stark white with a very shallow pitch to the roof that will not blend in over time and is not typical of the area.

See ‘Attachment D’- ref DMH Stallard comments

Conclusion

This application represents a clear and unjustified departure from the previously approved scheme. It is an over-scaled, poorly integrated, and privacy-invading development that fails to respect the character of the area and the neighbouring properties. We urge the Council to refuse this application on the grounds of visual impact, overdevelopment, poor design, loss of privacy and contrary to planning policy.