

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 23 January 2025 17:44:56 UTC+00:00
To: "Stefan Galyas" <stefan.galyas@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/24/3125

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 23/01/2025 5:44 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	135 College Lane Hurstpierpoint Hassocks West Sussex BN6 9AF
Proposal:	Proposed two storey side and rear extension and alterations
Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	133 College Lane Hurstpierpoint Hassocks West Sussex
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments:	The purpose of this statement is to express our formal objection to aspects of the above planning application, DM/24/3125, in respect of 135 College Lane, Hurstpierpoint. Our fundamental objection is the loss of daylight in the kitchen/dining room of our property, 133 College Lane, Hurstpierpoint, and the overbearing nature of the scale of the proposals.
-----------	--

We understand there is scope for developing the property. While a single-storey rear extension similar to that at 137 College Lane would partially reduce the daylight entering our kitchen/dining room, we think this would be a reasonable development.

However, we formally object to:

1. The current proposals for a 1st-floor extension to the rear of the property, with the ridge height of the proposed roof over 'Bed 1' on the plans extending to the east by 14.495m from the current highest point of the roof. This we believe, contravenes our legal right to light under the terms of the Prescription Act of 1832, which refers to light which has been enjoyed without interruption for at least 20 years. The light has been enjoyed since the two properties, 135 and 133 College Lane, were built in the mid-1930s, and our property has received light without interruption. We also believe further protection can be registered under the 1959 Rights of Light Act. In addition, these proposals arguably constitute overdevelopment in terms of sheer size and volume, given that the new footprint appears to be around three times that of the original 'dwelling house' and is overbearing compared to adjacent properties.

2. The inclusion of two new ground-floor windows and doors on the south-facing elevation of the original house will directly look into our kitchen/dining room.

We are sure you will consider the BRE Report, 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: a guide to good practice' (BR209) as it relates to existing buildings and overshadowing calculations.

We are mindful of the Mid Sussex District Council's Design Guide, in which Sec 09 refers to household extensions. Page 130 Principle DG50 - front and side extensions. Page 131 Principle 51 - rear extensions. Page 132 Principle 52 - roof extensions. In particular, DG 52 states, 'Roof extensions and dormer windows that alter the existing ridge of the roof or significantly alter the roof profile of the building will not normally be acceptable.' We would refer you to the roof plans submitted and the side elevation as it affects the north-facing side of our property, 133 College Lane. This shows the extended ridge of the roof over the ground floor extension, which, in our view, should be considered unacceptable.

We ask that you give due consideration to our objections and other comments regarding this development and planning application and, if appropriate, draw this to the attention of the planning committee.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, and we look forward to your response and acknowledgement of receipt of this email.

Yours sincerely,

Kind regards