

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 10 May 2026 19:07:32 UTC+01:00
To: "Andy Watt" <andy.watt@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/0973

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 10/05/2026 7:07 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	5 Cheney Crescent Haywards Heath West Sussex RH16 4UE
Proposal:	Proposed rear dormer loft conversion and installation of solar panels
Case Officer:	Andrew Watt

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	7 Cheney Crescent Haywards Heath
----------	----------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	We are the residents and owners of 7 Cheney Crescent, the terraced house next to 5 Cheney Crescent, and wish to object to the planned development as currently shown. Our reasons for doing so are as follows. In the Supporting Statement posted online, point four addresses Design and Residential Amenity: "4. Design and Residential Amenity The dormer is modest in scale, positioned on the rear elevation, and consistent with typical
-----------	---

PD roof enlargements in modern housing developments. The proposal does not result in unacceptable overlooking, overshadowing, or loss of privacy to neighbouring properties."

The statement says it is "consistent with typical PD roof enlargements in modern housing developments". There are none of these roof enlargements in this row of houses. It would be the first of this type and not in keeping with the surroundings, particularly given the proposed size.

The dormer is described as "modest in scale". What scale has been used? If this means relative to the current size of the property then we do not agree with the description. Guidance on dormers as provided by Mid Sussex District Council (<https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/1973/dormer-window-and-rooflight-design-guidance.pdf>) is as follows:

"Large, box-like, flat-roof dormers will conflict in form with the roof of most houses or bungalows and are generally unacceptable, particularly on the most prominent roofslope. Excessively wide dormers also look unsatisfactory as they will often be out of proportion with the existing roof. The width of a dormer should generally not exceed 1.2m."

According to the plan, the dormer is 5.2 metres in length. It is clear from the plan that what is meant by length is the width:

"Height of dormer = 2.71m Projection of dormer = 3.65m Length of dormer = 5.2."

This is 433% larger than the width a dormer should not generally exceed, as per the guidance.

The statement also says that, "The proposal does not result in unacceptable overlooking, overshadowing, or loss of privacy to neighbouring properties."

How was this evidenced? There are no criteria given for what would be unacceptable. There appears to be no evidence provided for this at all.

It is apparent from standing outside that the dormer would place our patio area in shadow for a period of time during the afternoon. That is an area that is in use. The addition of a dormer would have the effect of creating a three-storey elevation. Has this been assessed and evidenced appropriately, for example with a view to satisfying the requirements of DP26 within the Mid Sussex District Plan and Chapter 9 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide?

Given the planned width of the dormer, which, based on the plans, is right up to the party wall, it would impinge on any future plans of our own to develop the loft, as Velux windows to the rear would

likely have reduced light and visibility.

Though it is not obligatory to do so, there has been no consultation regarding the proposed development. E.g. on the party wall or the use of our property to gain access for development and access for future maintenance.

Kind regards