

Katherine Williams

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 March 2025 15:43
To: Katherine Williams
Cc: Kim Blumberg
Subject: 11 Oathall Avenue, Haywards Heath - Proposed first-floor rear and side extensions (DM/25/0343)

[REDACTED]

Dear Katherine Williams

1. We visited Oathall Avenue on Friday 28th February, in order to exercise our professional judgement on the prospective impact of this proposal on the amenities of no.13. When we witnessed at first hand the height of the existing flat-roofed extension and appreciated its proximity to the common boundary, it was soon evident that another flat-roofed storey (with balcony) on that foot-print would have a marked detrimental impact on the amenities of the residents of no.13.. We have consequently been instructed by [REDACTED] to notify you of their **OBJECTION** to this proposal.
2. Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan sets down eleven "Character and Design" requirements that all development proposals must satisfy. Requirement 6 is considered particularly pertinent in this case - it requires that development *"...does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents...including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight and noise air and light pollution."* In similar vein. Checklist 8 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide calls on applicants to "Consider your neighbours" - *"Has the applicant considered and demonstrated that the proposal does not cause significant harm to neighbouring properties in relation to overshadowing, privacy or an oppressive or overbearing impact?"*
3. The 'catslide' roof at the east end of the front elevation of no.11 is a notable feature of the Oathall Avenue street-scene but it would need to make way for a hip-roofed first-floor extension. With reference to "Loft conversions and roof extensions", Principle DG53 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide states that *"As a general rule extensions that alter the existing ridge of the roof or significantly alter the roof profile of a building will not be accepted."* As the proposed side extension would render the frontage of no.11 asymmetrical, there is no reason to depart from that principle on this occasion.
4. The topography of Oathall Avenue falls naturally east-west, so the garden of no.11 was already higher than that of no.13 before the single-storey rear extension was erected (and, even then, above natural ground level). The flat roof of the existing rear extension of no.11 already stands well above the boundary hedge, so it is evident that, with another storey of building, the proposed rear/side extension would be dominant and over-powering and consequently detrimental to the outlook of the residents of no.13, especially from ground- and first-floor windows on the west side of their rear elevation.
5. While the 'Combined Design & Access and Planning Statement' submitted by Richardson Architecture Limited asserted that *"The rear balcony is pushed back under the roof line and side walls, prohibiting views towards neighbouring gardens"*, there can be little doubt that the length and width of the proposed balcony would make it an attractive venue for a wide variety of social events and, as the presence of attendees would be evident from the garden of no.13, our clients would be acutely aware that they were being overlooked and the privacy of their rear garden would be lost. Issue is clearly taken with the agent's assertion in this regard.
6. Our close scrutiny of this proposal has led us to the view that the applicants have not accorded due weight to the requirements of the District Plan or the Design Guide - on the contrary, they have brought forward a proposal that would significantly alter the roof profile of no 11 Oathall Avenue and would significantly harm the residential amenities of no.13 Oathall Avenue, particularly through the loss of outlook

and privacy. As this proposal clearly fails to satisfy the requirements of the development plan, planning permission should be **REFUSED**.

Kind regards,

