

Andrew Horrell

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 01 December 2025 20:05
To: Andrew Horrell
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application DM/25/2896

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 01/12/2025 8:04 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	5 Orchard Road Burgess Hill West Sussex RH15 9PG
Proposal:	Proposed first floor rear extension
Case Officer:	Andrew Horrell

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	3 Orchard Road Burgess Hill
----------	-----------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	Subject: Formal Objection to Planning Application DM/25/2896 at 5 Orchard Road, Burgess Hill, RH15 9PG

Dear Mid Sussex Council Planning Department,

Applicant's Address: 5 Orchard Road, Burgess Hill, RH15 9PG
Application Number: DM/25/2896
My Address: 3 Orchard Road, Burgess Hill, RH15 9PG

I am writing to submit a formal objection to the above planning application for a two-storey rear extension.

My property at 3 Orchard Road, Burgess Hill, RH15 9PG shares a boundary with the applicant's property. The proposed development, due to its excessive scale, southern orientation, and direct proximity, will cause severe and demonstrable harm to the amenity of my home. My objection is founded on the following material planning considerations, with direct reference to the Mid Sussex District Plan and the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.

1. Severe Loss of Daylight, Sunlight, and Overshadowing (Direct Conflict with Policy DP26)

Under Policy DP26 (Amenity) of the Mid Sussex District Plan, development must not cause significant harm to the amenity of neighbouring residents. The proposal is in direct breach of this policy.

Impact on Primary Living Space: My property features a 4m single-storey extension with two large roof lights. These are not secondary light sources; they are the primary source of natural light for our main family living room. The proposed 6m ground-floor and 3m first-floor extension, built directly on our shared southern boundary, will cast a significant and damaging shadow over these roof lights, drastically reducing daylight to this essential habitable space.

Inaccurate and Misleading Plans: The applicant has failed to show our roof lights on their submitted plans. This is a critical omission that makes any daylight and sunlight assessment conducted by the council fundamentally flawed and based on inaccurate information. An honest assessment is impossible without acknowledging the feature most impacted by this proposal.

Lack of Formal Assessment: For a development of this scale, orientation, and proximity, a BRE Daylight & Sunlight Assessment (in line with BR209) is essential for a fair and technical evaluation. The absence of this assessment is a critical failure in the application, preventing a proper understanding of the true impact.

2. Breach of the 45-Degree Rule (Conflict with Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD)

The Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD uses the 45-degree rule as a key test to protect neighbouring properties from overshadowing and loss of light.

A 3m first-floor extension built hard on the boundary line will unequivocally breach the 45-degree line when measured from the centre of our living room roof lights. While typically applied from a vertical window, the principle of protecting the main light source to a habitable room is identical. The proposal therefore fails to meet the council's own established design standards for protecting neighbour amenity.

3. Overbearing Impact and Sense of Enclosure (Conflict with Policy DP26)

In a mid-terrace context, a 3m deep first-floor extension built upon a 6m deep ground-floor projection creates an imposing, dominant, and overbearing sheer wall.

This runs directly contrary to the principles of good design outlined in Policy DP26 and the Design Guide SPD, which explicitly seek to prevent oppressive, overbearing environments that harm a neighbour's sense of outlook and enclosure. The result will be a tunnel-like effect at the rear of our property.

Conclusion

The proposed extension, by virtue of its excessive depth, massing, and southern orientation, causes demonstrable and unacceptable harm to the amenity of my property. It is in clear conflict with the core principles of the Mid Sussex District Plan regarding neighbour amenity (DP26) and fails to comply with the specific guidance in the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD, particularly the 45-degree rule.

Furthermore, the planning application is based on inaccurate and incomplete drawings that omit the most critical features of my property affected by this proposal. The council cannot, therefore, make a lawful, fair, or informed determination.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Council takes these significant concerns into account and refuse this planning application.

Yours faithfully,



Kind regards