

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 21 May 2025 21:21:04 UTC+01:00
To: "Andrew Horrell" <andrew.horrell@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/0437

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 21/05/2025 9:21 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	The Beaumont 8 Ockley Lane Hassocks West Sussex BN6 8BA
Proposal:	Proposed two storey side extension and single storey rear extension. External works to reduce and level the driveway. (BRE light impact plan received 14/04 and AIA Tree report received 13/05).
Case Officer:	Andrew Horrell

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	10 Ockley Lane Hassocks
----------	-------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	In addition to my wife's comment, on reading the Light Study from Catherine Whitby Architects I am extremely concerned about the material impact on our property that is assessed within this study. To take the impacts from the study: 1) Opening 3 Kitchen window.

The current VSC is assessed at 24% and this is materially impacted to 16% by the proposed development (by their maths) which is a fraction over the 5-15% guideline for 'adequate daylight becoming challenging'.

It is clear that the light to this opening is materially impacted by the proposed development and this will significantly impact the light into our kitchen area.

2) Opening 4

Living room 1

The current VSC is 26% and this is even more materially impacted to 17% by the proposed development (by their maths), again which is a fraction over the 5-15% guideline for 'adequate daylight becoming challenging'.

Again it is clear that light to this opening is materially impacted by the proposed development.

3) Opening 5

Living room 2

The light study claims that this is unaffected.

However, the proposed development is the across the full side elevation of No.8 so by definition this would also impact Opening 5 which is directly opposite No.8.

It is not 'set behind' but would also clearly impact the light to this opening to a degree not assessed in the study.

The relevant planning officer will need to clarify this.

Taking (2) and (3) I am extremely concerned that the light into our living room would be materially impacted which is in accordance with the comments from the planning officer visit.

4) The study then takes a weighted average of the light into the living room taking into account opening 6 which I assume is the front elevation opening and using the light from opening 5 above which has not been correctly assessed.

As a result to mathematically claim the light in the room has a VSC of 27% and therefore acceptable.

We find this assessment unacceptable.

Firstly it is clear that openings 4 and 5 are materially impacted and therefore light into the room is then dependant on the opening of the front elevation.

Secondly it is unclear that taking a weighted average of light from various openings to calculate the impact on a large living room is a relevant method of calculating the impact on the room; or even a permissible method under current BRE Guidelines.

In summary taking the assessments from this Light Study it is clear that the proposed development would have a material impact on light into the kitchen area and into the living room to an unacceptable degree.

I hope that common sense and courtesy prevails and the design is

altered to take account of the material and unacceptable impact on our property.

Kind Regards

Kind regards