

Caroline Grist

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 August 2026 22:21
To: Caroline Grist; planninginfo
Subject: Objection to Planning Application DM/26/1265 38 Savill Road, Lindfield

Dear Caroline,

The email of pictures I sent earlier today should be seen as complementary to the response below.

Objection to Planning Application DM/26/1265
38 Savill Road, Lindfield

I respectfully request that Mid Sussex District Council refuse planning application DM/26/1265.

My objection concerns the development as actually constructed and, in particular, the material differences between the development now before the Council and the scheme previously approved under DM/24/2698.

The central issue is that the previous permission was assessed and found acceptable having regard to a particular design and a particular set of mitigating circumstances. Most significantly, the approved front extension incorporated a pitched roof, which the Council's own Planning Officer expressly identified as helping to reduce visual bulk and as contributing to the conclusion that the impact on neighbouring property, particularly No. 36 Savill Road, would not be significant enough to warrant refusal.

The development as constructed has instead been built with a flat-roofed first-floor front extension.

This is not simply a cosmetic alteration. It materially changes the appearance, massing and relationship of the extension to the original dwelling, the street scene and neighbouring properties.

1. The Previous Permission – DM/24/2698

Planning permission DM/24/2698 was granted on 31 January 2025 for a two-storey front extension and a part ground-floor/part two-storey rear extension, with associated alterations.

The officer's delegated report is particularly important because it explains why that scheme was considered acceptable.

The proposed front extension was approximately 1.9 metres deep at first-floor level and approximately 5.3 metres wide. It incorporated an asymmetric pitched roof, with the roof sloping away from No. 36 Savill Road. The proposed separation from No. 36 was approximately 1.8 metres.

The officer expressly relied upon the pitched roof when assessing the visual impact of the proposal.

The report states that, given the depth of approximately 1.9 metres and “the pitched roof, which assists in reducing some of the visual bulk”, the proposed extension would not appear overly dominant in the street scene. The officer also considered that the design would still allow the original building to be understood.

The importance of the roof form is even clearer in the assessment of the impact on No. 36.

The officer acknowledged that the proposed extension would result in “some impact to daylight and outlook” at No. 36. However, the officer concluded that the harm would not be significant enough to warrant refusal because of the combination of:

- the additional depth;
- the pitched roof;
- the fact that the roof would slope away from No. 36; and
- the approximately 1.8 metre separation distance.

This is highly significant.

The pitched roof was therefore not merely an architectural preference. It formed part of the planning reasoning which led the Council to conclude that the development was acceptable.

2. The Development Now Constructed Is Materially Different

The applicant's own Design and Access Statement for DM/26/1265 expressly confirms that the development as built differs from the approved drawings. This applies to the rear extension as well as the front extension.

It states that the works were carried out under DM/24/2698, but that the development as built differs from the approved drawings and that the current application has therefore been submitted to regularise the as-built scheme. It further confirms that the existing and proposed drawings represent the as-built condition.

This is therefore not an application concerning a hypothetical future development. The Council is being asked retrospectively to decide whether the building that actually exists is acceptable. The current elevations show that the front first-floor extension has been constructed with a **flat roof**, rather than the pitched roof which formed part of the approved design. That distinction is fundamental.

3. The Pitched Roof Was a Specific Mitigating Feature

The Council's previous report provides clear evidence of why the pitched roof mattered. In relation to the street scene, the officer concluded that the extension would not appear overly dominant because its approximately 1.9 metre depth, together with the pitched roof, helped to reduce visual bulk.

In relation to No. 36, the officer again relied on the pitched roof, specifically noting that it would slope away from that neighbouring property. The officer acknowledged some impact to daylight and outlook but concluded that the impact would not amount to significant harm having regard, amongst other things, to the pitched roof and separation distance. The current flat-roofed form removes that mitigating characteristic. It therefore cannot reasonably be assumed that the previous assessment remains applicable simply because the general footprint of the extension may be similar. The Council previously assessed a pitched-roof extension. It is now being asked to assess a flat-roofed extension. Those are materially different forms in terms of visual massing and their relationship with neighbouring property.

4. Effect on the Character of Savill Road

Policy **DP26** requires development to be well designed, to reflect the distinctive character of the town or village, to address the character and scale of surrounding buildings and landscape, and not to cause significant harm to neighbouring residential amenities.

The Mid Sussex Design Guide is also a material consideration. The Council's previous report records DG49 as requiring extensions normally to be well integrated with the existing scale, form and massing so that the original building remains the dominant element, whether it has one or several additions. The current flat-roofed first-floor projection is substantially more visually assertive than the approved pitched-roof arrangement. The pitched roof provided a sloping transition above the first-floor extension and reduced the apparent bulk of the addition. The flat roof instead creates a strong horizontal termination and a relatively uninterrupted vertical first-floor face. Particularly with the black cladding. The result is a more pronounced box-like extension which, in my view, is not subordinate to the original dwelling. This is particularly important because the site has characteristics which increase its visibility. The previous officer recorded that the dwelling is set at a higher land level than the highway and that Savill Road inclines to the west. The front extension is therefore experienced from public viewpoints in a manner which makes its first-floor massing particularly apparent.

The previous officer accepted that the front extension would alter the street scene, but concluded that the impact was not significantly harmful partly because the pitched roof reduced visual bulk. The Council should now reconsider that conclusion in light of the actual flat-roofed form.

5. The Development Is Not Subordinate to the Original Dwelling

The applicant's current Design and Access Statement states that the proposed development will remain within the "appropriate scale" seen in neighbouring properties. However, this is an assertion rather than a demonstrated planning conclusion. The statement does not adequately address the specific concern identified in the previous officer's report: namely, that the pitched roof assisted in reducing the visual bulk of the front extension. Nor does it explain why the substantially different flat-roofed form should be considered equally subordinate to the original dwelling. This is particularly important when the front and rear extensions are considered cumulatively. The previous officer's report itself recognised that the rear extension was larger in scale and related less successfully to the rear elevation, although it was accepted in the particular circumstances of the approved scheme. The as built roof line of the rear extension differs in the way it meets the roof of the original dwelling.

The completed development should therefore be assessed as a whole. The Council should consider whether the combination of the front extension, porch/canopy and substantial rear extension has resulted in a building where the original dwelling is no longer the clearly dominant element. In my view, the cumulative scale and massing of the completed development amount to overdevelopment and are inconsistent with the principles of DG49.

6. Impact on No. 36 Savill Road

The effect on No. 36 is a particularly important consideration. The previous officer specifically identified No. 36 as the property most closely affected by the front extension. The officer acknowledged that the approved extension would have some impact on daylight and outlook. The conclusion that the impact was not significant enough to warrant refusal relied partly upon the pitched roof, its slope away from No. 36 and the approximately 1.8 metre separation. The current flat-roofed extension changes that relationship.

Outlook and overbearing effect

The flat-roofed first-floor projection presents a substantial and relatively uninterrupted vertical mass towards No. 36. The outlook from the front bedroom window at No. 36 is particularly relevant. The constructed extension has a more dominant presence in that outlook than the approved pitched-roof form. The concern is not simply the loss of a private view. It is the increased sense of enclosure and

overbearing effect created by the built form immediately within the outlook of a neighbouring habitable room.

The Council should therefore assess whether the constructed form causes significant harm to outlook and residential amenity under DP26.

Daylight and sunlight

The previous officer expressly acknowledged some impact on daylight and outlook at No. 36. The Council should not simply carry that previous conclusion forward because the development now has a materially different roof form. The current assessment should take account of the actual constructed height, massing, roof profile, orientation and separation from No. 36. The flat roof creates a greater uninterrupted wall-like mass than the approved pitched roof, and the previous mitigating slope away from No. 36 is no longer present.

I therefore ask the Council to give specific consideration to whether the constructed form results in significant additional harm to daylight and sunlight reaching the front bedroom and other affected areas of No. 36.

Privacy and overlooking

The current development should also be assessed in respect of the size and position of its first-floor windows. The Council's previous assessment of the rear extension, for example, placed weight on the fact that certain windows were obscure glazed, associated with bathrooms, or positioned so that views would be oblique. The current application should similarly assess the actual fenestration that has been constructed and its relationship with neighbouring windows and private garden areas. The large first-floor window at the front of the development is materially different in scale from the original first-floor fenestration and should be assessed in terms of its actual viewing angles and potential overlooking of neighbouring private amenity space.

7. The Applicant's Reliance on Other Properties Does Not Resolve the Issue

The Design and Access Statement identifies Nos. **36, 44 and 46 Savill Road** as precedents for various forms of extension. However, the existence of extensions at other properties does not establish that the development at No. 38 is acceptable. Each planning application must be considered on its individual planning merits, including its particular scale, form, siting and relationship with neighbouring properties. This is particularly relevant to No. 36. The fact that No. 36 has itself benefited from planning permission for an extension does not demonstrate that the development constructed at No. 38 causes no unacceptable impact to No. 36. Indeed, the previous officer's assessment specifically considered No. 36 and acknowledged some impact to daylight and outlook. The officer's conclusion that this was not significant enough to warrant refusal depended partly on the design characteristics of the approved scheme, including the pitched roof.

The applicant cannot therefore rely on the existence of an extension at No. 36 as a reason why the current development should automatically be considered acceptable.

8. The Retrospective Nature of the Application

The retrospective nature of DM/26/1265 is important. The applicant's own Design and Access Statement confirms that the development as built differs from the approved drawings and that the current application is intended to regularise that development. The Council therefore has the opportunity to assess the actual development against the development plan and material planning considerations. The previous permission under DM/24/2698 established the acceptability of the

approved scheme; it did not establish the acceptability of a materially different development. The previous officer's reasoning is particularly relevant because it identifies the features which helped to make the approved development acceptable. Where one of those features — the pitched roof — has subsequently been removed, the Council should not simply assume that the previous planning balance remains unchanged.

It should reassess the development as constructed.

9. Cumulative Impact

The Council should assess the development as a whole, rather than considering each extension in isolation. The front extension materially increases the first-floor massing of the property. The rear extension adds substantial further footprint and bulk. The porch/canopy and associated alterations contribute to the overall enlargement and visual transformation of the original dwelling. The Mid Sussex Design Guide principle DG49 specifically recognises that extensions should remain integrated with the existing scale, form and massing so that the original building remains the dominant element, whether it has one or several additions. In my view, the cumulative effect of the completed development is that the original dwelling is no longer sufficiently dominant. The flat-roofed front extension is particularly important because it makes the first-floor addition appear more substantial and visually assertive than the pitched-roof form which the Council previously considered acceptable.

The result is an excessive cumulative scale and massing which does not satisfactorily respond to the original dwelling or the established character of Savill Road.

10. Conclusion

The central issue in this application is not whether an extension to No. 38 could in principle be acceptable. Planning permission was previously granted under **DM/24/2698**, but it was granted for a particular design. The Council's own officer expressly identified the pitched roof as helping to reduce visual bulk and preventing the front extension from appearing overly dominant. The officer also relied upon the pitched roof, together with the separation distance and depth of the extension, when concluding that the impact on daylight and outlook at No. 36 would not be significant enough to warrant refusal. The applicant's current Design and Access Statement confirms that the development as built differs from the approved drawings.

The most significant difference is the replacement of the approved pitched-roof form with the flat-roofed first-floor projection now constructed.

That change:

- removes a design feature previously relied upon by the Council to reduce visual bulk;
- creates a more pronounced and uninterrupted first-floor mass;
- makes the extension more visually dominant from Savill Road;
- changes the relationship between the extension and No. 36;
- increases the sense of enclosure and overbearing effect from No. 36;
- requires the previous daylight and outlook assessment to be reconsidered;
- raises concerns regarding privacy and overlooking from the enlarged first-floor fenestration; and
- contributes to the cumulative enlargement of the dwelling.

The previous permission should therefore not be regarded as establishing the acceptability of the development now constructed.

I respectfully request that Mid Sussex District Council refuse **DM/26/1265** on the basis that the development as constructed fails to satisfactorily comply with **Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan** and the relevant principles of the **Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD**, particularly **DG49 and DG50**, and causes unacceptable harm to the character of the area and the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

In particular, I ask the Council to give substantial weight to the fact that the pitched roof was expressly identified in the previous officer's assessment as reducing visual bulk and helping to mitigate the impact on No. 36, whereas the development now constructed does not incorporate that feature.

I'd be happy for you to view 38 from view points at 36 in order to assist your assessment of the application.

Kind regards

[Redacted Signature]

36 Savill Road