

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 02 November 2025 16:05
To: Catherine Cardin
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application DM/25/1996

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 02/11/2025 4:05 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	5 The Holt Haywards Heath West Sussex RH16 4XR
Proposal:	Proposed front ground floor extension to extend the existing garage. Side first floor extension over the existing garage and utility room. Hip-to-gable loft conversion with dormers, with juliette balconies to the front elevation. (amended plans received 13.10.2025)
Case Officer:	Catherine Cardin

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	12 Buckeridge Way Haywards Heath
----------	----------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Dear Ms Cardin, The amended proposed latest plan received on 13/10/2025 does not affect the Objection I made on 30/09/2025. For clarity, the latest plan appears merely to transpose certain elements from one side of the applicant's property to the other. This does not mitigate the planning harms set out in my Objection of 30 September 2025, which I respectfully maintain in full.

Further points of emphasis regarding privacy:

1. No improvement to privacy in the latest plan: The revision in the latest plan does not change the relationship between the proposed works and my home or garden. The key overlooking routes remain and, in practice, the potential for perceived and actual loss of privacy to my rear garden, patio and rear facing rooms is unchanged.
2. Real world evidence that privacy is already sensitive: As I stated in my initial Objection, the applicant has already fitted obscure (matt) glazing and regularly keeps blinds/curtains in windows facing their internal garden and my property. This behaviour demonstrates that privacy is a real and ongoing issue, not a theoretical one, and is effectively acknowledged by the applicant's own actions.

I also note that in about 2022-2023 the applicant planted two trees (the tops of which are visible from our property), apparently in an attempt to reduce overlooking. This has not proved effective, as the area requiring cover is too wide for two trees to address, leaving substantial area open. Nonetheless, the planting is further contemporaneous evidence that privacy is a live concern within the existing setting.

3. Extensions and elevated elements would materially worsen overlooking: The new extensions and raised elements, if allowed, would introduce direct and more elevated views towards my garden and rear rooms at very short range. This would place activity at my property uncomfortably "on show" and would significantly erode the quiet enjoyment of my home and garden.
4. Kitchen/patio doors: everyday impact on family life: Our kitchen and dining room, used constantly during the day by my family, including small children, open through patio doors to the rear garden and look towards the applicant's house over the shared boundary fence. If the latest plan is permitted, normal day to day use of our kitchen and dining room in spring, summer and early autumn would feel exposed to direct observation, deep inside them. Unlike the applicant, who can preserve their own privacy with voile curtains and obscure glass, we cannot practicably screen a primary kitchen and dining room space in this way.
5. Pre-existing partial mutual views are not a justification for introducing new harm: I note in passing that if it is suggested that my existing second-floor windows can already see a portion of the applicant's rear garden, that point would be untenable and irrelevant to the present assessment. The applicant purchased their property in or about 2019 with full knowledge of the established relationship between the two houses and took the property as found. By contrast, the privacy impact I raise in this Objection would be new and unexpected, created solely by the applicant's proposed extensions and new upper-level openings, which would introduce materially greater and more direct overlooking at closer quarters and from higher vantage points. The planning test is whether the proposal would materially harm neighbours' amenity; long-standing, reciprocal glimpses do not license an increase in harm brought about by latest plan.

Policy context and planning judgment

The latest plan does not alter the fundamental conflicts with Policy DP26 (Character and Design) of the Mid Sussex District Plan and the privacy principles in the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD (2020) (including the expectation to avoid direct overlooking of private amenity space). The revised arrangement continues to fail to secure a high standard of amenity for existing occupiers and so remains contrary to the development plan and national design policy.

The reasons stated in paragraph "B) Character and appearance" of my Objection dated 30/09/2025 are respectfully repeated.

Conclusion

For these reasons, and those previously set out on 30/09/2025, I respectfully request that the application be refused.

As before, I would be pleased to facilitate a site visit so that the privacy relationships and everyday impacts can be fully appreciated on the ground.



Kind regards