


13 Oakwood Road
Burgess Hill
RH15 0HU
6/2/2026

Planning Application: DM/26/0134

Proposal: Two-storey side extension at 12 Barons Court, Burgess Hill

Dear Case Officer,

I am writing to object to the above application on the grounds of **loss of light, loss of outlook, overbearing impact**, and **significant harm to residential amenity** affecting multiple rooms and the main amenity areas of my home.

My property directly adjoins the application site and faces the rear elevation of No. 12 Barons Court at a right angle. The spacing between the properties is already extremely tight, and the proposed extension would bring a substantial two-storey mass significantly closer to every main room and to the entirety of my rear garden. This would materially increase the sense of enclosure and reduce the openness that my home currently relies on.

I have provided photographs in a separate appendix to illustrate the existing relationship and the areas of sky and sunlight that would be lost.

1. Impact on Appearance and Character

The proposed extension introduces a large two-storey structure directly beside the shared boundary. In a cul-de-sac where spacing between houses is already limited, this would appear visually dominant and out of scale with the immediate context.

The extension would erode the small but important sense of openness between the properties, which sit at a right angle across the boundary between Barons Court and the adjacent part of Oakwood Road.

2. Loss of Light and Sky Visibility (Ground Floor)

Reception Room (Photo R1)

The reception room currently benefits from a narrow but valuable area of open sky to the left of No. 12. The proposed extension would remove a significant portion of this, reducing daylight and creating a more enclosed outlook from this principal living space.

Kitchen (Photos K1 & K2)

Both kitchen windows face directly towards the proposed extension. The extension would sit squarely within the line of sight from both windows, reducing sky visibility and increasing enclosure. The loss of this openness would materially affect the daylight and outlook from the kitchen.

3. Loss of Light and Outlook (First Floor)

Main Bedroom (Photo B1)

This room currently enjoys a modest but important area of open sky to the left of No. 12. The extension would be brought significantly closer, reducing sky visibility and blocking evening sunlight. This would noticeably reduce the quality of outlook from this principal bedroom.

Bedroom 4 / Home Office (Photo S1)

This room is used daily as a home office. The extension would remove much of the remaining open aspect and sky view, resulting in a more enclosed and overshadowed outlook throughout the working day.

4. Overbearing Impact and Enclosure (Garden Amenity Space)

My entire rear garden sits at a lower level than the ground floor of No. 12. This means the proposed extension would appear significantly taller and more imposing when viewed from any point in the garden.

Patio Level (Main Amenity Space) (Photo G1)

From the main patio area, the extension would substantially increase the sense of enclosure and dominance along the boundary. This would materially reduce the openness and enjoyment of this primary outdoor amenity space.

Grass Area (Evening Sun) (Photo G2)

From the grass area, the extension would block the remaining late-day and evening sunlight and reduce the visible sky. As we are at work during the day, this evening sunlight period is particularly important to how we use our home.

These two viewpoints demonstrate that the harm is not limited to one corner of the garden but affects the entire lower-level amenity space, including the area used for evening sunlight.

5. Cumulative Impact Across Multiple Rooms and Spaces

The proposal would harm:

- the ground-floor reception room
- the ground-floor kitchen
- the first-floor main bedroom
- the first-floor home office
- the main patio
- the grass area used for evening sun

Because the extension is brought so close to the boundary, the sense of enclosure would be experienced from **every vantage point** — indoors and outdoors. This represents **cumulative harm across the whole rear elevation and garden**, not a single isolated impact.

6. Relevant Planning Principles

The proposal conflicts with established planning principles and guidance which seek to:

- safeguard reasonable levels of daylight and outlook
- prevent overbearing development
- protect neighbouring amenity
- ensure extensions respect the scale and spacing of surrounding properties

The height, massing, and boundary position of the extension do not meet these requirements.

7. Conclusion

For the reasons set out above — including loss of light, loss of outlook, overbearing impact, and significant harm to multiple rooms and amenity spaces — I respectfully request that this application be **refused**.

Should the applicant wish to pursue an alternative design, a **reduced height, increased set-back**, or **single-storey solution** would be more appropriate and less harmful to neighbouring amenity.

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the author.