

## Rachel Richardson

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 11 October 2025 12:40  
**To:** Rachel Richardson  
**Cc:** Pam Clarke  
**Subject:** Planning application DM/25/2253 - objection

[REDACTED]  
Dear Ms Richardson,

We are writing to formally object to planning application DM/25/2253 for the proposed two-storey dwelling in the rear garden of 2 Keymer Road, Hassocks. As the owners of 19 Clayton Avenue our property backs onto the proposed development site, and we have serious concerns regarding the scale, design, amenity impact, and potential precedent this application may set. We would note that we did not object to the original proposal for a single storey dwelling, but feel the new proposal is not appropriate for the following reasons:

### 1. Overdevelopment of the Site

The proposed scheme represents a significant intensification of the site compared to the previously approved application DM/23/3181, which permitted a modest single-storey timber-clad dwelling designed to blend with the surrounding landscape. This new two-storey design is more intrusive both in scale and use, and includes features (such as a study with en-suite) that suggest it may in fact be used as a three-bedroom home.

Such overdevelopment in a rear garden setting is wholly inappropriate for the character and grain of this area and poses unacceptable implications for neighbouring privacy, density, and environmental quality.

### 2. Visual Impact and Unneighbourly Design

The proposed structure is stark and unsympathetic in design. The flat, white-rendered walls and shallow roof form contrast sharply with the predominantly pitched roofs and warm, natural materials (brick, tile, and timber) that characterise the area.

Rather than harmonising with its setting, the new build would present as an obtrusive and alien feature—particularly when viewed from adjacent gardens and the public footpaths nearby. The use of white render, which will weather poorly and highlight dirt and staining, only amplifies its visual dominance.

This design fails to respect the requirements of both:

- **Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan**, which requires new development to reflect the character of the locality and contribute positively to the local environment.
- **Policy 9 of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan**, which promotes high-quality design that reflects the local character and setting.

### 3. Loss of Privacy



A particular concern is the first-floor balcony facing south and east, which would offer direct lines of sight into numerous neighbouring gardens and homes. The suggestion that timber slatting will provide privacy is wholly inadequate. These slats are unlikely to remain effective over time due to weathering, and even in new condition, do not eliminate overlooking.

This results in a real and constant loss of private amenity space for neighbouring residents, who should reasonably expect a degree of seclusion in their gardens.

#### **4. Parking and Access Issues**

There is no dedicated vehicular access to the rear dwelling. The proposal instead relies on sharing just four parking spaces with the existing dwelling at No.2 Keymer Road. This limited provision is clearly insufficient for two separate dwellings and will almost certainly lead to parking displacement into surrounding roads such as Clayton Avenue, Chancellor's Park, and Woodlands Road.

Given the proximity of the site to a busy bus stop and a well-used pedestrian footpath, additional parking pressure could create safety concerns and increased congestion, particularly at peak hours.

#### **5. Environmental and Community Impact**

Although the application makes reference to solar panels, it does not address the significant tree cover around the site that will reduce their effectiveness. We are also concerned that trees may later be removed to "solve" this issue—thereby damaging the area's biodiversity and green character.

Additionally, the scale and location of the proposed development raise concerns about noise disturbance during both construction and eventual occupation. We urge the Council to consider imposing strict limits on building hours should any form of development be permitted on this site.

#### **6. Precedent and Cumulative Impact**

Approval of this application risks setting an unwelcome precedent for further backland and garden developments, gradually eroding the character of this part of Hassocks. While the principle of some limited development may have been accepted in the earlier, more modest consent, this application seeks to go far beyond what is reasonable or appropriate for the site.

#### **Conclusion**

The proposal in DM/25/2253 does not respect the established character, scale, or residential amenity of the area. It represents an over-scaled, visually intrusive, and privacy-impacting form of development that runs counter to both local and district-level planning policies.

I respectfully urge Mid Sussex District Council to refuse this application and uphold the character and residential amenity of our neighbourhood.

Yours faithfully,



**19 Clayton Avenue,**

**BN6 8HD**