

Katherine Williams

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 March 2025 08:05
To: Katherine Williams
Cc: Judith.Blocker@Gmail.Com
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.9. 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.9.. We have consequently been instructed by [REDACTED] 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 flat roof of the existing rear extension of no.11 already stands well above the boundary vegetation, so it is evident that, with another storey of building, the proposed rear/side extension would be dominant and over-powering and thereby detrimental to the outlook of the residents of no.9, especially from the ground- and first-floor windows on the east side of their rear elevation. While the house and garden of no.9 enjoy a slightly elevated position compared to no.11, it was evident that the extension proposed at no.11 would block the enjoyment of direct sunlight, especially late morning when the sun is low in the sky - the proposed extension would generate an unacceptable degree of overshadowing and loss of sunlight. .

4. 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.9, 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.

5. It is submitted that the first-floor rear and side extensions proposed in application DM/25/0343 would cause significant harm to the residents of no.9 Oathall Avenue through the loss of outlook, privacy and direct sunlight; as the proposal fails to satisfy the requirements of the Mid Sussex District Plan Policy DP26 and Checklist 6 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide, planning permission should be **REFUSED**.

Kind regards,

Robert Tutton
Director

