

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 30 September 2025 12:26
To: Catherine Cardin
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application DM/25/1996

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Orange Category

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 30/09/2025 12:25 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 description 09.09.2025)
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, I am the owner and occupier of 12 Buckeridge Way RH16 4XQ, which adjoins and is directly affected by the proposal. With all due respect to the owners of 5 The Holt, I wish to register my objection to the application. In summary, the proposal would cause significant and demonstrable harm to my home's amenity (privacy and outlook) and to the established character and appearance of Foundry Gardens Estate. It fails the key tests in Policy DP26 (Character and Design) of the Mid Sussex District Plan and multiple principles in the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD (2020), and it

conflicts with national design policy in the NPPF (Achieving well designed places), which confirms that development of poor design should be refused.

For good order, I will first summarise the harms arising from the proposed new constructions, and then set out my four submissions in further detail.

1) Executive summary of harms:

- Overlooking and loss of privacy: A new, elevated rear dormer with full height opening (Juliette balcony) would look directly down into my most private garden areas and rear facing rooms from a third level, creating constant and intrusive overlooking. The design positively encourages residents to stand at the opening, worsening perceived and actual overlooking. This is squarely at odds with the Design Guide's requirement to avoid direct overlooking of private amenity space.
- Overbearing enclosure and loss of outlook: Replacing the current hipped roof with a sheer full height gable and adding a two storey side extension within roughly 10-15 metres of our boundary would present a tall, looming wall where a low garage roof and sloping hip exist today. The combined bulk would close the gap between houses, and create a pronounced terracing effect, materially diminishing outlook to sensitive rooms and garden. A simple 45 degree assessment from the nearest affected window indicates likely adverse impact, yet no daylight/sunlight study accompanies the application.
- Harm to character and appearance: The Holt's and whole areas' consistent hipped roofscape, balanced proportions and planned spacing are fundamental to its sense of place. A hip to gable conversion, together with bulky side massing and oversized dormers (including front dormers that introduce a discordant "two and a half storey" effect), would be incongruous and would fail the Design Guide's subservience and roof extension principles.
- Cumulative harm and policy conflict: The cumulative scale and form overwhelm the original dwelling and undermine local distinctiveness. The scheme therefore fails DP26 and related SPD principles (DG45, DG49, DG50, DG52), and it does not achieve the NPPF objective of a high standard of amenity and context responsive design.

2) Site context and what is proposed

Foundry Gardens Estate is a recent, coherently designed estate (c.2019) with staggered plots, consistent hipped roofs and valuable gaps between dwellings that provide pleasant views to trees and sky. 5 The Holt currently has a hipped main roof and a single storey side garage near our boundary, which helps reduce perceived bulk and overlooking. The application seeks: (i) a front garage extension projecting further towards the street; (ii) a first floor side extension above the garage (with minimal or no meaningful set back or drop in ridge height); and (iii) a hip to gable roof conversion with rear and front dormers, the latter with Juliette balconies. In effect, it turns a modest two storey house into a much larger five bedroom plus dwelling with substantial additional mass at upper levels.

3) Planning framework (development plan-led)

I note that under section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, decisions must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Further, section 70(2) T&CPA 1990 requires regard to the plan and other material considerations. The Mid Sussex District Plan (notably DP26: Character and Design) and the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD (2020) provide the key local tests. National policy in the NPPF (Chapter 12) is a material consideration and supports refusal of poorly designed development that fails to reflect local policy.

4) Detailed grounds of objection

A) Residential amenity

A1. Rear dormer (with Juliette balcony) unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy

I note that the dormer would introduce a new, higher vantage point roughly a storey above existing first-floor windows, affording steep downward views across my private garden, patio and rear rooms. The full-height doors and guarding invite occupants to stand at the opening, exacerbating surveillance and the perception of being overlooked during normal garden use. Crucially, I have observed that the applicant has themselves retrofitted obscure (matt) glazing to first-floor windows at 5 The Holt and routinely keep their internal curtains partly drawn to prevent views through the transparent sections of the windows into their rooms. That action is a tacit admission that the current relationships are highly sensitive and that clear glazing already gives rise to unacceptable inter-visibility. Introducing an even higher, full-height opening with a Juliette balcony would inevitably and materially worsen the very privacy problem the applicant has sought to mitigate. The Council should give significant weight to this real-world evidence when assessing the dormer's impact.

The likely separation distance to my primary rear façade is in the order of c.15-20 metres (to be confirmed on plans), which is below or at best marginal against typical privacy expectations and, crucially, is made far more intrusive by the increased height and direct angle from a third level. The SPD's Principle DG45 requires that direct overlooking of private amenity space should normally be avoided. This proposal does the opposite. It therefore fails DP26 on privacy.

A2. Front dormers (with Juliette balconies): elevated mutual overlooking across the street

I further note that no houses on this frontage currently have high level front dormers. Introducing them would create unusual third level inter visibility with the dwelling opposite, harming the settled amenity relationship and street's character. Whilst front to front relationships carry less weight than rear privacy, the effect here compounds the design harm and detracts from amenity, contrary to DP26 and the NPPF's expectation of a high standard of amenity.

A3. Side facing windows

I further note that plans indicate a new side-facing first-floor opening within a few metres of the boundary. If not obscure-glazed and high-level, this would cause direct overlooking of my side access and any side-facing windows/door, further eroding privacy. Given that the applicant has already resorted to obscure (matt) glazing at first floor to address privacy concerns, any side-facing openings must, at the very least, be fixed-shut below 1.7m internal floor level and permanently obscure-glazed to a high level. Anything less would be unreasonable and contrary to their own acknowledged sensitivity of the relationship.

A4. Overbearing mass, loss of outlook

The hip to gable change and two storey side extension (approximately 6-7m to eaves / c.9m to ridge, ~10m off the boundary) would replace a low, recessive edge with a tall vertical wall and gable immediately adjacent to my property. For my property, this would close the designed gap between Nos. 5 and 7, create a terracing effect, and result in a strong sense of enclosure from both house and garden, materially reducing outlook and visibility. A straightforward 45-degree test from the nearest affected window is likely to be breached, indicating adverse visibility impact, yet no BRE 209 analysis has been submitted. This is a classic overbearing relationship, contrary to DP26 and the Design Guide's amenity principles.

B) Character and appearance

B1. Harmful roof alteration in a uniform hipped roof context

It is rather obvious from the character of this development that Foundry Gardens, and, specifically, the area of The Holt and Buckeridge Way, is defined by hipped roofs and a harmonious roofscape. A full height gable end would be an alien, hard edged profile, conspicuous from multiple viewpoints on the street. I note that the Design Guide (DG52) cautions against roof extensions that significantly alter the profile, especially where there is a strong, established roofline - precisely the case here.

B2. Side extension fails the subservience test

Good extension design requires subservience, that is, clear set back and a lowered ridge/eaves so the original house remains dominant. Here, the side addition appears flush or only tokenly set back, seemingly matching the main ridge, thus reading as a full width enlargement rather than an ancillary element. This breaches DG49/DG50 and conflicts with DP26.

B3. Oversized/ill proportioned dormers and front clutter

The rear dormer spans a large proportion of the roof and sits uncomfortably close to ridge and eaves, failing the requirement that dormers be visually subordinate and leave a generous margin of main roof visible. The front dormers (with Juliette rails) are uncharacteristic on this elevation and impart a top heavy, two and a half storey appearance to the façade, eroding the estate's simple roof planes and elevational discipline. This conflicts with DG52 and DP26.

B4. Forward garage projection and erosion of planned spacing

Projecting the garage forward risks disrupting the established building rhythm at the entrance to the close. More fundamentally, the side massing would fill the designed gap between homes that currently affords breathing space and green views, undermining the estate's carefully planned character. The cumulative result is overdevelopment that is out of keeping with its surroundings, contrary to DP26.

B5. Persuasive appeal context

I must also note that Planning Inspectors have repeatedly dismissed proposals that: (i) convert hips to gables within streets defined by hipped roofs, and/or (ii) introduce bulky dormers/unsuccessful side massing, finding harm to character and subservience. The pattern of reasoning in those decisions mirrors the concerns here and supports refusal in line with DP26 and the Design Guide.

C) Parking and knock on effects (secondary but relevant)

By significantly increasing bedroom numbers (likely to 5+), the dwelling could warrant additional on plot parking under West Sussex guidance. The front extension may shorten the driveway, and practical garage usability is uncertain. Any shortfall would displace parking onto the street, to the detriment of local amenity. While secondary to the design/amenity harms, this reinforces the overall planning balance against the scheme.

5) Policy conflict summary

- Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP26 (Character and Design): fails on amenity (privacy and outlook) and on character/scale (lack of subservience, incongruous roof/dormers, loss of spacing).
- Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD (2020): conflicts with DG45 (Privacy), DG49 (General principles for extensions - subservience), DG50 (Front/side extensions), and DG52 (Loft/roof extensions).
- NPPF (Achieving well designed places): the scheme is not sympathetic to local character, fails to secure a high standard of amenity for existing users, and constitutes poor design that should be refused.

Given the clear development plan conflict and lack of countervailing public benefits, section 38(6) of the 2004 Act points decisively to refusal.

6) Conclusion

The proposal represents overdevelopment that would harm my family's living conditions and damage the character of Foundry Gardens and specifically the area of The Holt and Buckeridge Way (within Foundry Gardens). It is in clear conflict with the development plan and associated guidance, and there are no material considerations that would justify setting those policies aside. I therefore respectfully request that planning permission be refused.

I would be pleased to facilitate a site visit so the case officer can appreciate the relationship on the ground and the extent of overlooking and enclosure that would result.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted Signature]

Kind regards