

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 September 2026 15:15
To: planninginfo
Subject: FW: Planning Application Dm/26/1805 - RE-SENDING AS REQUESTED
Attachments: 1000094881.jpg; 1000095016.jpg; 1000094879.jpg

[REDACTED]
Dear Sirs,

I am writing in response to the DM/26/1805, namely the Retrospective application for the erection of 2 pergolas and a wooden shed in rear garden of 5 Clayton Park, Hassocks.

Whilst I have no wish to deprive the owners of the right to erect pergolas or fences in their garden, the following should be taken into consideration in considering whether planning permission should be granted:

1. The boundary shown on the plan submitted by their architects between numbers 4 and 5 Clayton Park is inaccurate. (This is not the first time inaccurate plans have been submitted on behalf of Mr and Mrs Binks in relation to previous planning permission applications). The boundary line on the section between the house themselves is in fact equi-distant between the houses, and not closer to number 5 as shown. The relevance of this is detailed below.
2. Both the garden to no 4 and no 5 have been extended by purchasing land from the Stanford Avenue properties behind. Their gardens do not follow the same boundary as those in Clayton Park. This means that the 'extra' garden of no 5 effectively juts out into what would ordinarily be the garden line between 2 properties. This portion of the garden which used to belong to the Stanford Avenue property to the rear of number 5 in fact juts out much further into the garden of number 4 than is shown by the plans. Rather than being in line with the side of the house, it juts out a further 60cm. This is relevant because it means that there is a much bigger impact from having tall buildings in the garden of number 5 along the 'extra' garden boundary line, particularly where they are close to properties. This directly impacts the appearance of the area, which is mature gardens with usual minimal small barbecue use.
3. The chimney is significantly minimised in the submitted plans. It is in fact a very large and unsightly chimney flu made of metal and as can be seen from the attached photographs, taken from inside no 4, is very clearly visible and more akin to a commercial chimney flu. It protrudes some 50cm or more above the pergola height.– see attached photographs. It has deliberately been placed on the boundary line, ie: as close as possible to the neighbouring property, rather than along the back boundary with Stanford Avenue, where it would be further from any properties – no 5, no 4 and the Stanford property to the rear. This would have caused significantly less intrusion. See photograph, being the view from the lounge and bedroom of no 4. I therefore object to the chimney aspect of the rear pergola.
4. The chimney is also located close to mature shrubbery and as such is a fire hazard. A construction of this kind is more akin to that for a commercial oven and has no place in a residential context – certainly not where it can be directly seen from the lounge of a neighbouring property.
5. When the chimney is in use – which during a recent heatwave was frequent in the evenings, a noxious smell comes from – presumably - firelighting material and clouds of smoke billow across the garden of number 4. See attached photographs and video. This necessitates the closing up of all windows to the rear of the property and the garden cannot be used. During heatwave evenings this caused particular loss of amenity and even made sitting in the house difficult, since the windows needed to be open to release the heat that had accumulated during the day but could not be whilst the chimney was in

use. A barbecue without a huge chimney deliberately sited on the boundary, but more centrally in the garden of no 5 would not have caused this to happen.

6. The chimney has a significantly overbearing impact and causes loss of outlook and residential amenity for no 4. It is very large and is the first thing that can be seen when looking out of the window. See photographs taken from lounge and bedroom window attached. It is also an intrusion into the countryside, the gardens in this area all being mature and largely laid to garden rather than the extensive hardstanding that now covers the garden of no 5, which is more akin to the outlook of a new development.
7. I do not believe that no 5 has any Permitted Development Rights, owing to the extensive development of the site. Therefore even if the pergola complied with the PDR height of 2.5 metres, planning permission would be required. The owners would have known thus, having made several planning applications in the past. They chose not to do so. If the chimney is to remain in the pergola, I submit that this should be refused.
8. The second pergola and shed are very close to the house at no 4, and are much more overbearing because of the 'jutting' of no 5's 'extra' garden section. These 2 buildings make the garden feel more like that in a modern development, which Clayton Park is not. See photographs attached. They are clearly visible from the window of no 4 owing to their location (ie: not to the side of a property, owing to the jutting of the garden).
9. Granting planning permission for an outbuilding that consists of not 1 but 2 pergolas, plus a shed, where the undeveloped land remains only around 50% of the 'extra' garden, and none of the original garden, would be a) overdevelopment, and b) set a precedent for further overdevelopment in the village.
10. I would submit that in order to comply with planning regulations and the local plan, a maximum of 1 pergola, as far from any properties as possible, without a chimney should be the maximum permitted in order to avoid detrimental impact to residential amenity if neighbouring properties.

Kind regards,

[Redacted Signature]

4 Clayton Park, Hassocks BN6 8JQ