

RE: PLANNING APPLICATION DM/25/3095 - Proposed first floor rear extension to form bedroom, and a new porch and roof dormer to front elevation — 40 Gander Hill, Haywards Heath, RH16 1QX

I have reviewed the daylight report submitted by XDA Consulting, commissioned by Payne's Heating & Plumbing Services Ltd on behalf of the applicant. I have a number of concerns regarding the accuracy and reliability of the results, which I would ask the Council to consider.

I also note that architectural drawing **EA0147.PL5 (42 Gander Hill)**, which the report states was used to construct the 3D model of my property, does not appear on the planning portal. I would be grateful if this could be uploaded so that I can review how my property has been modelled. I intend to review the report in full detail upon receipt of this drawing, but wish to raise the following points now.

Vertical Sky Component (Table 5.1)

Windows 3 and 5 show a VSC *increase* in the proposed scenario (18.2 to 18.4, and 17.8 to 18.3). As the proposed development adds massing, it is unclear how the visible sky from these windows could increase.

This does not reflect the physical reality of the site.

Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (Table 5.3)

The APSH results are identical to two decimal places for every window in both annual and winter scenarios. Window 1 directly faces the proposed extension, which at approximately 7.2m high is located roughly 7m away.

It is difficult to understand how a structure of this size and proximity, directly in the sun's path, could produce no change whatsoever to sunlight hours.

My photographic evidence submitted on 3 February 2026 shows winter sunlight currently just clearing the existing single-storey roofline from Window 1.

The proposed extension would block this direct sunlight.

This directly contradicts the report's finding of zero change in both annual and winter APSH.

No Sky Line (Table 5.2)

BRE Section 2.2.10 states the impact on the daylighting distribution (NSL) should only be carried out "Where room layouts are known (for example if they are available on the local authority's planning portal)"

The consultant did not know our living room dimensions, so the assessment does not appear to follow BRE guidance.

The report assumes a room depth of 3m, but my living room is 3.69m deep - a material modelling error of over 20%. It is difficult to see how this would not materially affect the NSL results (0.88 existing, 0.88 proposed).

Looking out through Window 1 towards the proposed 7.2m extension at 7m distance, the extension would clearly block the view of the sky. Currently, sky is visible over the existing single-storey flat roof. The loss of sky through Window 1 would be expected to affect NSL, yet the report shows no change.

Was the proposed model updated?

With VSC values that increase, APSH and NSL figures that are identical to the decimal place, and results contradicted by photographic evidence, this raises a fundamental question:

Was the proposed extension actually included in the model for all calculations?

Cumulative impact

BRE Section 3.2.10 requires that where a development involves successive extensions, the cumulative impact should be assessed, and “the total impact on skylight due to all the extensions needs to be calculated” (2.215).

No. 40 has been extended at least twice previously on this side of the property:

- a double-storey side extension, and
- a single-storey rear extension.

The proposed first-floor extension would be the third successive extension affecting light to No. 42. The report uses the current situation as its baseline rather than the original property before these extensions. A cumulative assessment has never been carried out.

Conclusion

In my previous objection of 3 February 2026, I stated that I did not believe any technical assessment could reach a different conclusion to the photographic evidence. The report now submitted does appear to reach a different conclusion, but only by producing results that appear inconsistent with the physical reality of the site.

With so many inconsistencies, estimates, missing plans, identical figures, and results contradicted by real-world evidence, I do not consider this report to be credible. I respectfully request that the Council seeks clarification from the consultant on the points raised above, and does not place undue weight on this report before any decision is made on this application.

I reserve the right to comment further upon receipt of drawing EA0147.PL5 and following a detailed review of the report.

42 Gander Hill
Haywards Heath
RH16 1RD