

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 02 July 2026 15:31:31 UTC+01:00
To: "Catherine Cardin" <Catherine.Cardin@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/26/1444

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 02/07/2026 3:31 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	5 Dexter Drive East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 4SU
Proposal:	Proposed rear first floor balcony over existing approved rear ground floor extension and to include a staircase from ground to first floor and adding patio doors to selected existing rear first floor windows.
Case Officer:	Catherine Cardin

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	West House West Lane East Grinstead
----------	-------------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	I write to object, in the strongest terms, to the above planning application for a proposed first-floor balcony and external staircase. As the owner of West House, I have reviewed the submitted plans and consider that the proposal would cause significant harm to my residential amenity. The applicant has failed to consider the effect on West House.

1. The Existing Vegetation Screening

At present, a mainly evergreen hedge (approximately 4m in height and 0.5m-1.5m in depth) sits entirely within the grounds of West House. It is maintained annually and provides a degree of screening between West House and numbers 3, 5, 7, and 9 Dexter Drive. I am aware of the government's 'Action Hedge Height Regulations'

However, I do not consider that this existing hedge can be relied upon to mitigate the adverse impacts of this permanent structure. Hedges are subject to disease, storm damage, natural decline, or die, and therefore cannot be guaranteed to remain in perpetuity.

Therefore, I suggest that the planning merits of this application must be assessed on the spatial relationship between the proposed balcony in the absence of this screening.

2. Planning Objections

I. Unacceptable Loss of Privacy and Overlooking

The proposed balcony features an extensive 7 metre wide frontage, creating an elevated 3 metre high terrace, 160 degree viewing platform, situated 12 metres from the boundary fencing. Approximately 130 degrees of this outlook is directly on West House and garden.

-Topography: West House sits at a lower elevation than the applicant's site, estimated at 1 to 2 metres. No detailed site survey levels have been provided, therefore the true severity of this elevated, downward view, has not be assessed.

- Impact on Habitable Rooms: There is no assessment of the view directly in front of the proposed balcony. The actual downward southerly view is my ground-floor kitchen/living space with a bay window, garden doors (26metres to the balcony, 25015-PLA-402) and first floor windows. To the south-west, the applicant's own maximum visual impact assessment on neighbour No 7, Photomontage (2501-REP-402, Page 2, Viewpoint A) clearly shows a substantial area beyond the boundary fencing that is highly visible. This view is the full first floor frontage of West House and possibly my shared driveway and my immediate neighbour's house on West Lane.

- Impact on Private Amenity Space: My garden gently slopes, but features terraced lawns, flower beds, and seating area situated approximately 22 metres and 36 metres from the proposed balcony. Already the applicants' first floor can be seen from my garden through the present hedge. The proposed forward

projected balcony would completely strip my garden of its privacy.

- While the applicant has proposed glazed side screens to protect immediate side neighbours, no mitigation whatsoever is proposed for the principal outward view facing West House.

I would suggest that the potential level of overlooking would conflict with Mid Sussex District Council's design policies.

II. Overbearing and Dominant Visual Impact.

The proposed structure is not a modest balcony, but a substantial 7 metre wide, 4.7metre high outdoor space (3m high terrace + 1.7m side screens/height of an individual), situated approximately 12 metres from our mutual boundary.

Because the applicant's property sits at a higher elevation, the proposed balcony will form a very dominant (>5 metres high), intrusive, and overbearing feature when viewed from most of my garden and East and North facing house windows.

III. Noise and Disturbance.

A 21 square metre elevated balcony with two French doors and an external staircase, functions as a substantial elevated outdoor living space and social area, rather than a standard balcony. I suggest that the scale of the space is designed for prolonged use, including dining, and social activity.

Sound travels significantly further from an elevated position. The situation of the balcony so close to the boundary, with no screening will result in unacceptable noise into the quiet enjoyment of my home.

3. Omission of Essential Information

The submitted application does not include any assessment of the impact of the proposed elevated balcony on West House and nor is there any topographical information to assess the significant height differential between our properties given that there is complete overlooking. This is a significant omission.

Conclusion and Precedent

If approved, this proposal would set a highly undesirable precedent for large permanent, elevated balconies along the odd numbered houses in Dexter Drive, leading to a cumulative loss of privacy on West House and even extending to my immediate neighbour on West Lane. This would be completely out of character with the layout of this Crest Nicholson development.

For the above reasons, I respectfully request that Mid Sussex District Council refuse this application.

Kind regards