

Stefan Galyas

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk
Sent: 30 August 2025 18:13
To: Stefan Galyas
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application DM/25/2010

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 30/08/2025 6:12 PM.

Application Summary

Address:	22 St Wilfrids Road Burgess Hill West Sussex RH15 8BD
Proposal:	Proposed loft conversion incorporating hip to gable alteration. Removal of hipped roofs to the rear and creation of a balcony at second floor level.
Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	20 St. Wilfrids Road Burgess Hill
----------	-----------------------------------

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour or general public
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing to object to planning application ref: DM/25/2010 which seeks planning permission for a proposed loft conversion incorporating hip to gable alteration. Removal of hipped roofs to the rear and creation of a balcony at second floor level.

Having assessed the information submitted my concerns are that the proposal does not meet the policy tests for character and design in the adopted District Plan policy DP26 and would cause significant harm to the amenity of No.20 St Wilfrid's Road with particular respect to:

- Loss of privacy (balcony and gable window)
- Loss of light
- Overbearing impact
- Harmful visual impact
- Overlooking and light pollution from the proposed window in the gable elevation

The dwelling has already been extended in depth at two storey height at the rear. Application ref: DM/25/0277 confirmed that prior approval was not required for a single storey rear

extension (6m deep by 3m deep) which has not yet been implemented, and it is not shown on the plans. No formal assessment of the lawfulness of the proposed development has been made. The description does not include the first-floor rear extension which would align the first-floor bedrooms nor the increase in height of the extensions (see para 5.2 of the Planning Statement).

At para 1.3 of the Planning Statement, it states that 'elements of the proposal are what would typically be allowed under permitted development' and at para 3.6 provides a photo to show that both Nos. 18 and 28 on St Wilfrid Road feature hip-to-gable extensions. Whilst there is no information on whether those roof enlargements were undertaken under permitted development, there is no lawful development certificate for a hip to gable at No 22, and furthermore the works proposed are interrelated and therefore would not constitute permitted development.

The examples of other properties with dormer windows provided in the planning statement are completely different to what is proposed at No.22 in several respects: (1) They do not contain balconies. (2) They contain only dormer windows at 2nd floor level. (3) The properties are all in a line, and not set back as in the case of No.22 compared to No.20 and so the dormer windows in the other properties do not impact their immediate two neighbours in the same way that the proposal at No.22 does.(4) The properties shown have not already been extended to the rear at first floor level to the degree that the property at No.22 already has.

In terms of design, the insertion of a large flat roof dormer across the full width of the rear roofslope would be very dominant in terms of scale and massing. The existing lower pitched roofs at the rear will be removed and replaced with a flat roof which will span the full width of the property with a balcony and glazed screens above at second floor level. The design and proportions of the proposal do not respect the existing property and the proposed balcony at second floor level is uncharacteristic within the immediate area. The flat roof would be higher than the eaves of the main dwelling and look out of proportion and the roof form of the proposal would look contrived.

In terms of residential amenity, the existing dwelling is fully hipped and slopes away from the shared boundary with No 20. Equally, the rear extensions are pitched roof and fully hipped at the end and well set down from the main ridgeline, also sloping away from the shared boundary. The proposed roof alterations, insertion of full-width dormer and increase in height of the rear extensions, together with the screens on top of the two-storey flat roof, will significantly increase the scale and massing of built development in relation to No 20. Overbearing impact relates to scale, massing and general dominating effect of development proposals. The proposal will have an oppressive and dominating effect and result in a loss of light to the rear of this adjacent property and its private amenity area. This overbearing impact on No.20 is accentuated by the fact that No.22 is set back in relation to No.20 (as indicated in the site visit notes). The Planning Statement photograph (paragraph 6.3) shows this very clearly but the statement omits to say anything about it.

Window in gable end: Being an amateur astronomer, I also object to the proposed window in the gable end elevation overlooking my property at No.20 due to overlooking and light pollution at night (please see District Plan policy DP29).

Balcony: Second floor balconies can have a significant impact on the amenity of adjoining neighbours and should be avoided where this is likely. The screens on the balcony will be insufficient to protect privacy and result in perceived and direct overlooking to the private rear garden of No 20 and of No.24. Despite the comments made in paras 6.18 to 6.23 the screens would be totally ineffective in alleviating any overlooking to adjacent properties to the sides and rear and as a result would adversely affect the amenity and living conditions of the occupiers of No 20 and No.24. Whilst some views can already be obtained from the rear first floor bedroom windows this relationship is common in residential areas and whilst rear gardens are residential in nature, as noted above there are no similar balcony type structures at a second-floor level. Furthermore, the balcony will result in additional noise and disturbance in an elevated position which would not normally be found in a semi-detached residential context such as this. There is a clear difference in the overlooking and loss of privacy from persons sitting, associated gatherings or standing on a balcony for long periods of time as opposed to any overlooking caused, for example, from a rear window. Given the residential location of the property, these

changes to the overlooking and privacy as a result of this development carry a significant impact to the amenity and living conditions of the adjoining occupiers.

Therefore, based on the comments made above, the proposal is not considered to be of high quality of design and as such would be contrary to the adopted District Plan policy DP26: Character and Design and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024).

Yours sincerely

[Redacted Signature]

Kind regards