

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 05 March 2025 16:00:56 UTC+00:00
To: "Katherine Williams" <katherine.williams@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/0343

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 05/03/2025 4:00 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	11 Oathall Avenue Haywards Heath West Sussex RH16 3ES
Proposal:	Proposed first floor rear and side extensions. The rear extension to be built upon the existing rear ground floor extension with a full width balcony. The side extension to be built over the existing garage.
Case Officer:	Katherine Williams

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	13 Oathall Avenue Haywards Heath
----------	----------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	1. The applicant has not considered nor involved us as next-door-neighbours in the development of this submitted design. We provided comments on an earlier and different design back in 2022 when we made clear our objections to a proposed balcony. This proposed extension is very different and we have not been involved, nor comment sought from us, in the development of this particular design, contrary to the Design and Access Statement submitted by the architect as part of this planning application. We

have asked the architects to withdraw this statement from their application with you.

2. The applicant has not considered how the proposal causes significant harm to neighbouring properties in relation to overshadowing, privacy, overbearing impact. The rear extension impacts adversely on the outlook and privacy of the adjacent buildings and gardens.

a. The huge size of the proposed 1st floor extension and its dominance over our own property is considerable. The existing flat roof of their new ground floor extension is only a matter of a few centimetres below our 1st floor roofline guttering. The roof of their proposed first floor extension will come some way up our own angled roof and will extend beyond the rear of their house by over 5 metres. Thus we will have a very large bulky rectangular wall towering over our house and directly viewable from the windows of our living areas.

b. The proposed balcony extends across the whole of the rear of the planned extension at a significant height over our garden (much higher than a normal 1st floor balcony) and would lead to significant loss of privacy in our garden.

3. The roof form of the extension is not appropriate to the original dwelling, there is no pitch to the proposed 1st floor extension roof, with only a flat roof of over 5m in depth and 10m in width. There is no inclusion of dormer roof extensions nor any other attempt to utilise a less impactful roof slope.

4. The applicant has not demonstrated that the proposal responds to and respects the character of the area and the immediate neighbourhood. The size and type of the architectural style of the rear extension is inconsistent with the surrounding Turner buildings and the large rectangular side walls are of enormous bulk and utilise inappropriate materials

5. The building form does not compliment and coordinate with the scale, form and massing of the original dwelling, which is now no longer the dominant element of the property.

6. The materials proposed do not match in any way those of the existing dwelling.

7. There is no attempt to reflect or match the current window and door opening design in either size or style.

Kind regards