

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 January 2025 17:13:03 UTC+00:00
To: "Anna Tidey" <anna.tidey@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/24/2999

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 27/01/2025 5:13 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	1A Lodgelands Ardingly Haywards Heath West Sussex RH17 6SD
Proposal:	Proposed demolition of existing garages and erection of a pair of 3 bedroom semi-detached houses with on plot parking for two vehicles together with a replacement detached double garage.
Case Officer:	Anna Tidey

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	57 College Road Ardingly
----------	--------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Dear Sir/Madam, Re: DM 24/2999 I am corresponding to you in relation to the latest planning proposal for 1A, Lodgelands. I am a resident of Ardingly and live at 57 College Road, and have

been privy to the past applications DM/18/1358 (refused 17th September 2018), DM/22/1334 (granted 7th July 2022) and the most recent application DM/24/2999 (application made 12/12/2024). The latest plans seem to be a significant deviation on the previously approved plans and, therefore, raise concerns

Observations/Comments/Questions:

DM22/1334 was a 3 bedroom chalet bungalow which was granted planning permission on the 7th July 2022. This plan received no objections from myself for the following reasons:

1. Single storey building (with attic conversion style first floor)
2. The rear of the house did not have windows at the upper level. Just two Velux "flush" style windows. This maintained the privacy of the gardens and house directly in view (63, 61, 59 and 57 College Road).
3. An attractive property and solution that would enhance the area.

DM/24/2999 is a proposal for 2x three-bedroom semi-detached dwellings, with a ground floor and first floor as well as an attic space. I have the current concerns over the proposal:

1. Property Design - The two storeys will inevitably mean the building will be taller over a wider footprint than the bungalow proposal. However, the plans do not offer the actual height of the new proposal and how this compares to the approved bungalow. This development is directly south, meaning it will overlook and blocking natural light into the gardens of house numbers 61 and 59 (and potentially number 57) College Road.
2. Privacy - The new proposal will have both master bedrooms overlooking the gardens as well as the kitchens and bedrooms of house numbers 61, 59 and 57 College Road. This seems to go against what was agreed with the original plans that were accepted.
3. Privacy - Due to the likely height and additional windows, the garden footprint does not allow for adequate screening.
4. Building Clause - There is an understanding that when the land was put up for redevelopment, there was a clause that dictated that only one home could be built. Does this clause still stand and how is a new proposal affected by this now becoming two homes?
5. AONB - The new design does not offer the same visual aesthetic as the originally proposed bungalow, impacting this part of the village and its AONB status.

Other Observations and Questions:

1. Japanese Knotweed - Evidence was supplied by my neighbour that Japanese Knotweed was present and growing on the development site, most notably around the garage and the space behind it. I am very concerned that this not been properly treated
-

and as the land is being disturbed, will mean this hugely damaging weed is likely to be travelling. What reassurances and evidence has been given by the developer that this is under control

2. Over development - This part of the village has already seen significant development, with the field opposite (Stangrove Field) having the provision of more than 30 new homes with garages in Monks Meadow. This proposed new development does not seem to address the need to maintain the village's AONB status and will have a detrimental effect on the area compared to the bungalow.

3. Protected Ash Tree - What provisions have been made to protect the Ash Tree opposite the development? Is the development closer to its proximity and therefore affecting its root network?

4. Number 61 - The new owners of 61 College Road have just exchanged and all survey work and planning approvals would be in relation to DM22/1334. They will have no knowledge of the new proposal as it would not have come up in the searches at the time of purchase. This development directly affects them.

Having been extremely enthusiastic about the bungalow proposal, I find this new plan to have too many question marks, privacy concerns and dominance over our landscapes and gardens. To that end I can only raise an objection to this new plan.

Sincerely

Dunstan Rickard

Kind regards