

The head height is exactly what one would expect with an attic conversion of a house of this original design which had a relatively small footprint. The original plans submitted showed the areas where there would be 2.0 metres of headroom and where the scellings would be. To place a bath alongside one is simply bad design and does not warrant adding a skylight. Another dormer window is not a valid reason especially as the planning officer said she was never going to agree to this option . Although they have been reduced to two, one now has three panes of glass and both appear to be larger than the MSDC guidelines. I also do not understand how a Velux window is going to overcome the difficulty of not bumping one's head when getting out of the bath unless it protrudes above the roof tiles and is very large in area. None of this detail is provided and should be sought by the planning authority.

The "original overlooking" is not the point. Now there is in effect another storey to the building there are even more windows and these look down into our property and more importantly onto our bed. This never happened before, as the original overlooking windows could not see our bed as they are lower. It is this added exposure that is the reason we have been forced to install opaque privacy film on all the facing windows of our room and we feel justified in opposing even the slightest further intrusion to our privacy.

One assumes the neighbour's property referred to is No. 8. If so, then for reasons unknown, the same builder produced a far more satisfactory and acceptable design, as it has only one small dormer window with only two panes of glass and skylights. It also only overlooks the side of no. 10, which has no windows and it looks diagonally across to no.12. The ground is also fairly level . All these points are very important considerations and make it an incorrect comparison, as it does not look directly into or down into either of these properties. The conversion also looks far less intrusive and overbearing. So perhaps the compromise should be for no. 11 to remove their offensive dormer windows and replace them with only one of a similar size to no. 10 and copying the layout and sizes of their skylights? Or turning on the light as we have to in our en-suite despite having a window and likewise in the en-suite of our guest bedroom which has no natural light. We also have extractor fans in both. One of the photographs below is the view from the bed so in reverse the applicant must be able to see us! The second is taken standing near the other window



1



2

and the third shows how easily people either way can be seen. [See top left window]



3

Why should other properties be subjected to further loss of amenity? Surely common sense says the room should have been designed as a shower room? At the end of the day, as our planning consultant said, this is always going to be an attic conversion with limitations.

Perhaps the other compromise is to have a small skylight installed into the side of the roof facing the Haywards Heath road, as shown on the photograph? Again, similar to No. 10.

