

Representation and Technical Review

Proposed single-storey rear extension at 38 Renfields, Haywards Heath — application DM/26/2196

Application reference	DM/26/2196
Proposal	Proposed rear single storey extension
Site	38 Renfields, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 4TG
Local planning authority	Mid Sussex District Council
Case officer	Catherine Cardin, 01444 477340
Validated	7 September 2026
Neighbours notified	9 September 2026
Deadline for representations	30 September 2026
Prepared by	The owner/occupier of 44 Renfields, Haywards Heath
Date	18 September 2026

This is a planning representation and technical review. It is not legal advice, a measured building survey, a formal BRE daylight and sunlight report or a rights-of-light valuation. Passages in square brackets are matters I need to confirm from my own property before this document is submitted.

1. Summary of my position

I own and occupy 44 Renfields. My property faces the application site across the rear, and the applicant's own drawing P.06 is devoted specifically to the claimed effect on my house. I am not opposed in principle to my neighbours extending their home. I do object to this application being determined on the information currently before the Council.

My objection rests on three things.

- 1 The application contains no assessment of sunlight at all.** The only neighbour-impact evidence is a 25-degree daylight screening line on drawing P.06. Daylight and sunlight are different things, measured by different methods. My own sun-path analysis, set out in section 6, indicates that the extension would newly intercept direct morning sun to my rear doors and patio during the winter months. That is precisely the period the BRE winter criterion is designed to protect, and it has not been looked at.
- 2 The evidence offered about my property proves nothing.** Drawing P.06 carries the assertion that there is "no negative light impact to the neighbouring opening". It contains no separation distance, no sill or head height for my doors, no floor or ground datum for my house, and does not in fact draw my house in section. No separation dimension appears anywhere in the application.
- 3 The submitted documents are internally inconsistent.** The stated heights conflict with the section drawing in two places and cannot be reconciled by a single change of datum. The garden-area figures do not add up. Two drawings share the number E.04 and two more share an identical title. The application form states that proposed elevations were submitted; no such drawing is in the file. And the Council's own consultation schedule records no notification letter to my address.



2. The proposal as submitted

The application is for a single-storey rear extension with a lean-to roof rising from an outer eaves to a high point against the existing rear wall. The following figures are those given in the Design and Access Statement.

Depth	2.90 m
Width	4.63 m (not full width)
Eaves height	2.62 m
Maximum height	3.61 m
Walls	Brickwork to match existing
Roof	Roof tiles to match existing; Velux MK06 rooflight, not projecting more than 150 mm
Openings	New PVCu white double doors and casement windows

The submitted drawing set comprises E.01 to E.04 (existing), P.02 to P.07 (proposed) and a location plan. A schedule is at Appendix B.

3. The development plan and guidance

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the application to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. For this site the development plan and relevant guidance comprise:

- **Mid Sussex District Plan 2014–2031** (adopted 28 March 2018), in particular **Policy DP26: Character and Design**, which requires development not to cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents, including through loss of privacy, daylight, sunlight or outlook.
- **Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan**, in particular **Policy E9** and **Policy H9 (Building Extensions)**. These are part of the statutory development plan and carry full weight. Mid Sussex officer reports on comparable householder extensions in Haywards Heath cite them expressly alongside DP26.
- **Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD**, which sets out the Council's design principles for residential extensions, including its approach to overshadowing, overbearing effect and angular guidance.
- **Emerging Mid Sussex District Plan 2021–2039**, submitted for examination in July 2024, with hearings held during 2026. Its weight depends on the stage it has reached at the date of determination and should be checked.
- **National Planning Policy Framework**, which requires a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

- **BRE Report 209, *Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: a guide to good practice***, the standard technical reference for the assessments discussed below.



4. The relationship between my property and the site

This needs to be stated clearly, because the Design and Access Statement describes the orientation of the site incorrectly and the submitted drawings give no dimension between the two properties.

4.1 Orientation

The Design and Access Statement describes No. 38 as "a two-storey residential building on the south side of Renfields". If that were correct, the rear of the property would face south. It does not. The Proposed Block Plan (P.07) is drawn with a vertical north arrow and carries the Ordnance Survey easting gridline 532400, so its orientation can be read directly. It shows the dwelling on an axis of approximately 058 degrees, with the rear garden and the proposed extension projecting towards the east-north-east.

My own property lies to the north-west of the application site, in a separate terrace whose rear elevation faces the application site across the intervening gardens on a bearing of approximately 135 degrees, south-east. **[To confirm on site.]** The consequence is that the proposed extension sits close to the centre of the sector from which my rear rooms and patio receive their morning and middle-of-the-day sun.



4.2 Separation distance

No dimension between No. 38 and No. 44 appears anywhere in the application — not on the block plans, not on the floor plans, and not on drawing P.06, which is the drawing that purports to assess the effect on my house.

Scaling from drawing P.02 (1:100 at A3), and checking the scale against two independent features on the same sheet — the garage, which comes out at 3.0 m, and the plotted widths of Nos. 42 and 44, which come out at about 4.5 m each — the distance from my rear wall to the nearest face of the proposed extension is approximately **13 metres**. I should be clear that this is a scaled figure derived from a drawing which itself carries the note "Do not scale from this drawing", and it may be wrong by a metre or so. **[To be measured on site.]** It is the applicant's responsibility to state this dimension, not mine to estimate it.

At that separation the proposed extension subtends the following vertical angles as seen from my property:



Ground level at my rear doors	about 15.5 degrees	about 13.4 degrees
Head height of a 2.1 m rear door	about 6.6 degrees	about 4.3 degrees

Which of the two heights is correct is one of the unresolved questions in section 7.

5. Daylight — the 25-degree line on drawing P.06

Drawing P.06 is titled "Ex. & Pr. Section through 44 Renfields". It shows a 25-degree line drawn to a hatched block annotated "N. 44 Renfields Rear Doors", and carries the statement that there is "no negative light impact to the neighbouring opening".

The 25-degree obstruction angle is a recognised BRE screening test. Where a proposed obstruction subtends less than 25 degrees at the centre of a neighbouring window, measured in a vertical section

perpendicular to that window, a detailed daylight assessment is usually unnecessary. Used properly it is a useful and quick filter.

It has not been used properly here. The test depends entirely on two quantities — the horizontal separation and the height of the window above ground — and drawing P.06 states neither. In addition:

- my house is not drawn in section at all, only as a hatched block;
- no sill or head height is given for my rear doors;
- no internal floor level or external ground level is given for my property, although the plans show three different datums (+/-0.00, -0.29 and +0.19) across the application site alone, so levels plainly vary here;
- the point on my opening from which the 25-degree line has been struck is not identified; and
- the drawing is an elevation of No. 38 with a line attached to it, not a section taken perpendicular to my window.

I want to be straightforward about where this leaves things. On my own scaled estimate of roughly 13 metres, the 25-degree screen is likely to be satisfied, and I am not going to argue that this extension will cause a severe loss of diffuse daylight to my rear rooms. My point is different and narrower: **the applicant has made a positive assertion about my property and has provided nothing capable of supporting it.** A conclusion the Council cannot check is not evidence, and it should not be the basis for finding no harm.

5.1 No 45-degree test has been carried out for my property

Drawing P.05 applies a 45-degree line in relation to No. 36 Renfields. No equivalent test, on plan or on elevation, has been applied to No. 44 — even though No. 44 is the property the applicant chose to draw a dedicated section for. The Mid Sussex Design Guide's angular guidance should be applied to both affected neighbours, not one.

6. Sunlight and overshadowing — the assessment that is missing

Daylight is diffuse illumination from the sky as a whole. Sunlight is direct beam radiation from the sun, and it varies with orientation, time of day and time of year. BRE 209 treats them separately, using Vertical Sky Component and the No-Sky Line for daylight, and Annual Probable Sunlight Hours for sunlight — with a separate winter criterion measured over the period 21 September to 21 March. Overshadowing of gardens and amenity space is assessed differently again.

The BRE sunlight test applies to windows facing within 90 degrees of due south. My rear elevation faces approximately 135 degrees. **[To confirm.]** The test therefore applies to my property, and no sunlight assessment of any kind has been submitted.

6.1 My own preliminary sun-path analysis

Using the site's Ordnance Survey grid reference given on the application form (532391, 123147), I have calculated solar altitude and azimuth through the year and tested them against the proposed extension as an obstruction. The method and every assumption are set out at Appendix A. The extension, at approximately 13 m and 4.63 m wide, occupies roughly the 125 to 145 degree sector of my southern sky and rises to about 15.5 degrees above the horizontal at ground level.

The table below gives the periods when direct sun would be intercepted by the proposed extension. The middle column shows the *additional* loss at ground level, that is the loss over and above what an ordinary 1.8 m boundary fence already blocks — which is the comparison BRE requires. The right-hand column shows the loss at the head of a 2.1 m rear door, which sits above any such fence.

21 June	none	none
21 March	none	none
21 September	none	none
1 November	about 40 minutes	none
21 December	none — sun already below the fence line	about 60 minutes
1 February	about 40 minutes	about 15 minutes
Days affected per year	about 79	about 92

The pattern is consistent and, I think, easy to state. Between roughly mid-October and late February the sun in the relevant part of my sky is low, and the proposed extension moves into its path. Over the summer half of the year the sun clears the extension entirely and there is no effect at all. The loss is therefore concentrated in exactly the months when direct sun is scarcest and most valued, and when the BRE's separate winter criterion applies.



Three honest qualifications. My separation distance is scaled, not measured. The azimuths are derived from the block plan's north arrow rather than a survey. And part of the relevant sky sector may already be

obstructed by existing boundary treatment or planting that I have not modelled. Any of those could move the figures. That is an argument for the Council obtaining a proper assessment, not for proceeding without one.

7. Outlook and my rear amenity space

Even where an angular daylight test is cleared, the scale, height and position of a structure may still produce an overbearing effect or a loss of outlook. The Mid Sussex Design Guide treats these as distinct considerations, and they have not been assessed here either. The extension would introduce a new built form of up to 3.61 m across part of the outlook from my rear rooms and patio. **[To describe from the property: which rooms face the site, whether the rear doors are the principal source of light to a habitable room, and what is currently seen from them.]**

A site visit conducted from inside my rear room and from my patio would establish this far better than any drawing, and I ask for one.

8. Inconsistencies in the submitted information

8.1 The stated heights conflict with the section drawing

Drawing P.04, Proposed Section A-A at 1:50, carries two vertical dimensions. Neither matches the Design and Access Statement.



Maximum height	3.61 m	3.088 m	522 mm
Eaves height	2.62 m	2.278 m	342 mm

The significance is not simply that the figures differ. It is that **the two differences are not equal**. Had the written statement been measured from external ground level and the drawing from internal floor level, both differences would be the same. They are 180 mm apart. A single change of datum therefore cannot explain them, and one of the two sources is wrong.

This matters to me directly. As section 4.2 shows, the choice between 3.61 m and 3.088 m changes the angle the extension subtends at my property from 15.5 to 13.4 degrees at ground level, and from 6.6 to 4.3 degrees at door head height. It also determines what any permission would actually authorise.

8.2 No proposed elevations are on the file

The application form, under "references for the plans, drawings and/or design and access statement", states: "Proposed elevations, floor plans / Design and Access statement". Existing elevations are provided at E.01. **No proposed elevations drawing is in the documents I have been able to view**. The proposed drawings run from P.02 to P.07; there is no P.01.

Without proposed elevations the Council cannot properly assess external height, roof form, the position and proportion of openings, materials, or the appearance of the extension from my property. If the drawing exists and has simply not been published, it should be put on the register and the consultation period re-run. If it does not exist, the application is incomplete against the Council's own validation requirements.

8.3 Duplicate drawing numbers and titles

- **E.04 is used twice** — for "Existing Section A-A" and for "Existing Block Plan".
- **P.02 and P.05 carry the identical title** "Proposed Ground Floor Plan", at different scales and with different content.

If permission were granted, the standard approved-drawings condition would be ambiguous about what had in fact been approved, and correspondingly difficult to enforce. The drawing schedule should be corrected before determination.

8.4 The garden-area figures do not reconcile

Drawings P.02, P.03 and P.05 state: "Rear Garden: 61.37 m² (total). Remaining after the proposed rear extension: 41.77 m² > 50%". That implies a loss of 19.60 m². The stated footprint of the extension is 2.90 m by 4.63 m, which is **13.43 m²**. Some 6.2 m² is unaccounted for — close to, but not obviously the same as, the 6.31 m² shed shown on the same drawings.

Either the stated dimensions of the extension or the stated garden loss is wrong. Since the proportion of garden retained is one of the Council's usual tests for rear extensions, and since the footprint dimensions are the same ones used in the daylight argument, this should be resolved rather than passed over. The annotation also compares an area to a percentage, which is meaningless as written; the actual retained

proportion is 68%.

8.5 Errors in the Design and Access Statement

- It places the dwelling on "the south side of Renfields". The block plan shows the rear facing approximately east-north-east. See section 4.1.
- It describes the property as "an end-of-terraced dwelling house". The block plan does not obviously show that. **[To confirm.]** The description matters because the Council's guidance on acceptable extension depth distinguishes between terraced, semi-detached and detached houses.
- The document submitted under the heading "Supporting statement" is in fact a Flood Risk Assessment.

8.6 Applicant details and ownership certificate

The application form names the applicant as "Carol Ann **Snith**". Every drawing names the client as "Mick & Carol **Smith**". Certificate B has been completed, with notice served on another owner on 5 August 2026. I raise this only so that it can be checked and corrected: a decision notice issued in a misspelt name, or on a certificate that does not match the true ownership, is an avoidable problem for everybody including the applicant.

9. Neighbour notification

The document published with the application as "Site notes and file notes" includes the Council's "List of consultations made" for DM/26/2196. It records a letter sent on 09.09.2026 against Nos. 30, 32, 36, 40, 42, 46, 48, 50, 52 and 54 Renfields.

- **Against 44 Renfields — my address — the "Ltr Sent" column is blank.** It is the only address on the schedule with no date.
- **34 Renfields does not appear on the schedule at all.**
- The schedule's own sign-off boxes — "Initial neighbour check date", "Signed" and "Date received by Officer" — are all blank.
- The "Site Notices — Printed" box is empty, so the file shows no evidence that a site notice was displayed.
- Every address on the schedule is typed "Hyawards Heath".

[To state: whether I in fact received a letter, and if so on what date; and if not, the date on which I first became aware of the application and how.]

Article 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 requires the Council to publicise an application by, among other means, serving notice on adjoining owners or occupiers or displaying a site notice. I am plainly an affected neighbour: the applicant's own agent produced a drawing devoted to the effect on my house. If notification was not given, the consultation period has not properly run as against me.

10. Matters I understand are outside the Council's remit

I set these out so that it is clear I am not asking the Council to decide them, and so that my representation is not discounted for straying into them.

A private legal right to light (an easement, typically acquired under the Prescription Act 1832 after 20 years' enjoyment through a defined aperture)	Private property law. A rights-of-light surveyor and, if needed, solicitors. Planning permission neither grants nor extinguishes such a right.
Party Wall etc. Act 1996 notices, line-of-junction notices, adjacent-excavation notices and awards	A separate statutory process between owners. Note 4 on every submitted drawing confirms it is the homeowner's responsibility.
Boundary ownership, restrictive covenants, private easements and rights of access	Private law and HM Land Registry.
Trespass, encroachment by foundations, gutters, fascias or roof tiles; oversailing scaffolding; access for construction	Private law.
Structure, foundations, insulation, fire safety, drainage	Building Regulations — a separate application to Building Control.
Construction noise, dust and working hours once consent is in place	Environmental Health.
Build-over of public sewers	Southern Water and Building Control.
Loss of a view, loss of property value, and disputes between neighbours	Expressly excluded by the Council's own advice on the reverse of the notification letter.

For the avoidance of doubt, my representation is directed at loss of **sunlight**, seasonal **overshadowing**, **outlook** and **overbearing effect**, and at the **adequacy, accuracy and consistency of the submitted information**. All of those are material planning considerations. I am not asking the Council to adjudicate a private right to light.

11. Questions for the case officer

I would be grateful for a written answer to the following before the application is determined.

Status of the application

- 1 Given that the proposal as described sits within the limits of Class A, Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 — a depth of 2.90 m, eaves of 2.62 m, a maximum height of 3.61 m and a rooflight limited to 150 mm above the roof plane — can the Council confirm why planning permission is required? Specifically, were permitted development rights under Part 1 removed by condition on the original permission for this part of Bolnore Village, and if so, which permission and which condition?

Height and drawings

- 2 Which is the correct maximum height of the extension: the 3.61 m stated in the Design and Access Statement, or the 3.088 m dimensioned on drawing P.04?
- 3 Which is the correct eaves height: 2.62 m or the 2.278 m dimensioned on P.04? Please note that the two differences are unequal and so cannot be a single datum shift.
- 4 Which height was used in preparing the 25-degree assessment on drawing P.06, and if it is not the final proposed height, will that drawing be corrected and re-consulted?
- 5 Are complete proposed elevations available? The application form states that proposed elevations were submitted, but no such drawing appears on the register. If none exists, does the Council consider the application validly submitted against its own validation requirements?
- 6 Will the drawing numbering be corrected before determination, given that E.04 is used for two different drawings and that P.02 and P.05 share an identical title?
- 7 How are the garden figures reconciled? A stated loss of 19.60 m² does not follow from a footprint of 2.90 m by 4.63 m.

The assessment of 44 Renfields

- 8 What separation distance between 38 and 44 Renfields has the Council used, and from which document is it taken? No such dimension appears anywhere in the application.
- 9 Has the Council independently verified the 25-degree relationship shown on P.06, rather than relying on the applicant's statement that there is "no negative light impact"?
- 10 From precisely which point on my rear doors has the 25-degree line been struck, and what sill and head heights and floor and ground levels for 44 Renfields were used?
- 11 Has the Council carried out or required any assessment of **sunlight**, as distinct from daylight, to 44 Renfields — including the BRE annual and winter probable sunlight hours criteria, noting that my rear elevation faces within 90 degrees of due south?
- 12 Has the Council assessed additional overshadowing of my rear amenity space, and if so on what dates and by what method?
- 13 Why has the 45-degree test been applied in relation to No. 36 but not to No. 44, the property for which a dedicated section drawing was produced?
- 14 Has the Council established what accommodation lies behind my rear doors, whether they are a principal source of natural light to a habitable room, and whether that room has another window?

- 15 Has overbearing effect and loss of outlook been assessed separately from daylight?
- 16 Will the case officer carry out a site visit to 44 Renfields, from inside the affected rear room and from the patio, before determination?
- 17 If no detailed BRE assessment is to be required, on what basis has that conclusion been reached?

Procedure

- 18 Was a notification letter sent to 44 Renfields, and if so on what date? The Council's own consultation schedule records no date against my address.
- 19 Why does 34 Renfields not appear on the consultation schedule at all?
- 20 Was a site notice displayed, and if so where and on what date? The "Site Notices — Printed" box on the schedule is blank.
- 21 Will the Council confirm that 44 Renfields is formally recorded as an affected neighbour, and that this representation will be taken into account in full?
- 22 If amended drawings or corrected dimensions are submitted, will I be notified and given a fresh opportunity to comment?
- 23 Will the officer's report expressly record the assessment of the impact on 44 Renfields, covering daylight, sunlight, overshadowing, outlook and overbearing effect?

12. What I ask the Council to do

I object to the application in its present form. I am not asking for refusal of any extension at this property. I am asking the Council to determine the application on information that is accurate, complete and capable of being checked. Specifically:

- 1 **Do not determine the application until the height discrepancy is resolved** and the corrected figure is carried through to every drawing that assesses neighbour impact.
- 2 **Require complete proposed elevations** to be submitted and published, and re-consult on them.
- 3 **Require a sunlight and overshadowing assessment in respect of 44 Renfields**, dealing with the winter period and with my rear amenity space, and not treating the 25-degree daylight screen as answering it.
- 4 **Require drawing P.06 to be re-drawn with dimensions** — separation distance, sill and head heights, and ground and floor levels for both properties — or disregard it.
- 5 **Correct the drawing schedule** so that any approved-drawings condition is unambiguous.
- 6 **Confirm my notification** and, if no letter was sent, run a fresh 21-day representation period.
- 7 **Carry out a site visit to 44 Renfields** before determination.
- 8 **Record the assessment of 44 Renfields expressly in the officer's report**, covering daylight, sunlight, overshadowing, outlook and overbearing effect.

If the Council is minded to approve the application notwithstanding these points, I ask that it be referred to the Planning Committee so that the matters raised can be considered in public, and that I be notified in advance of the meeting so that I may exercise the right to speak referred to in the Council's own notification letter.

Appendix A — Method and assumptions for the sun-path analysis

Position. Solar altitude and azimuth were computed for latitude 50.9928 N, longitude 0.1154 W, derived from the Ordnance Survey grid reference 532391 E, 123147 N given on the application form. Times are given in local clock time, adjusting for British Summer Time where applicable.

Orientation. Taken from the Proposed Block Plan (P.07), which is drawn with a vertical north arrow and carries the Ordnance Survey easting gridline 532400. The rear elevation of No. 38 is read as facing approximately 058 degrees; the rear elevation of No. 44 as facing approximately 135 degrees.

Geometry. Separation from the rear wall of No. 44 to the nearest face of the proposed extension taken as 13.0 m, scaled from drawing P.02 at 1:100 on A3 and cross-checked against the plotted garage width (3.0 m) and the plotted widths of Nos. 42 and 44 (about 4.5 m each). Extension width 4.63 m and maximum height 3.61 m as stated in the Design and Access Statement; the extension is modelled as occupying the 125 to 145 degree azimuth sector as seen from the rear of No. 44.

Baseline. Ground-level figures are given net of a notional 1.8 m close-boarded boundary fence at 9 m from the rear wall of No. 44, so that they express the *additional* obstruction attributable to the proposal rather than total obstruction. Door-head figures assume a head height of 2.1 m above internal floor level and are not adjusted for the fence, which falls below that height.

What this is not. This is a first-principles sun-path screening exercise, not a three-dimensional radiance model. It does not compute Vertical Sky Component, No-Sky Line or Annual Probable Sunlight Hours, and it takes no account of existing planting, the existing two-storey dwelling and garage at No. 38 beyond the notional fence, or any difference in ground level between the two properties. Its purpose is to show that a sunlight effect exists and is capable of being quantified — which is why a proper assessment should have been provided with the application.

Appendix B — Documents reviewed

Householder application form (PP-15207976)	—	8 pages; Certificate B
Design and Access Statement	—	3 pages
Supporting statement	—	Flood Risk Assessment
Site notes and file notes	—	Notification letter and consultation schedule
Location Plan	—	1:1250 at A4
Existing Elevations	E.01	
Existing Ground Floor Plan	E.02	
Existing First Floor & Roof Plan	E.03	
Existing Section A-A	E.04	Number duplicated
Existing Block Plan	E.04	Number duplicated
Proposed Ground Floor Plan	P.02	Title duplicated with P.05
Proposed First Floor & Roof Plan	P.03	
Proposed Section A-A	P.04	Source of the 3.088 m and 2.278 m dimensions
Proposed Ground Floor Plan	P.05	Title duplicated with P.02
Ex. & Pr. Section through 44 Renfields	P.06	The daylight claim
Proposed Block Plan	P.07	
Proposed Elevations	P.01	Not present

All drawings are revision A, dated 02.09.26 ("Proposed windows & doors revised"), preceded by preliminary drawings of 28.08.26.

Appendix C — Sources

- Mid Sussex District Council, Online Planning Register, application DM/26/2196 (pa.midsussex.gov.uk/online-applications).
- Mid Sussex District Plan 2014–2031, adopted 28 March 2018 — Policy DP26.
- Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan — Policies E9 and H9.
- Mid Sussex Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.
- Mid Sussex District Plan 2021–2039 (emerging; submitted for examination July 2024).
- BRE Report 209, *Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: a guide to good practice*.
- National Planning Policy Framework.
- Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015, Article 15.
- Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A and Class C.
- Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, *The Party Wall etc. Act 1996: explanatory booklet*.

Appendix D — Limitations

- This document is a planning representation and technical review. It is not legal advice, a measured survey, a formal BRE daylight and sunlight report, a rights-of-light opinion or a structural opinion.
- It is based solely on the documents published by Mid Sussex District Council for application DM/26/2196 as at 18 September 2026. Amended drawings or further documents may change the conclusions.
- The separation distance between the two properties is scaled from a drawing that itself states it should not be scaled, because no dimension is given. It should be measured on site.
- Passages in square brackets are matters to be confirmed from 44 Renfields before this document is submitted.
- Application status, consultation deadlines and the status of the emerging District Plan should be rechecked on the Council's register immediately before submission.