

Sarah Valentine

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 June 2026 09:55
To: planninginfo
Subject: Fwd: Application no. DM/26/0412 Proposal: Proposed ground mounted PV solar panels Location: Barrington House, Portsmouth Wood Drive, Lindfield, Haywards Heath.

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Kay Greaves <kay_greaves@hotmail.com>
Subject: **Application no. DM/26/0412 Proposal: Proposed ground mounted PV solar panels Location: Barrington House, Portsmouth Wood Drive, Lindfield, Haywards Heath.**

Dear Sir/Madam

I object to the above application on the following planning grounds:

- It will have a significantly detrimental impact on the appearance of the surrounding area; it will visually dominate the street below in an intrusive & overbearing way, entirely at odds with the surrounding established vegetation and neighbouring architecture .
- This application states that the development will take place on ‘an unused area of the rear garden.’ The site is in fact at the very front of the property, overlooking several neighbouring homes. It is situated on steeply sloping ground, above a 6-foot high wall, and is a visually striking feature of the streetscape, visible both immediately on entering Barrington Wood, and within the cul-de-sac itself.
- Any ‘low-level screening’ would be entirely ineffective in mitigating the overbearing nature of this proposal, as the solar panels will be mounted on supporting structures and follow the steep slope of the bank above the wall, to a height above street level of at least 12 feet.
- the scale & nature of the proposal fails to protect the character of the existing area, both of the neighbouring properties and particularly of the two other properties which together constituted the original Edwardian House. (Barrington House is one of three interconnected properties formed when the original House was subdivided in the 1990s.)
- It is worth noting that an earlier planning application to develop this exact site was refused, both initially and at its subsequent appeal. (Ref: DM/23/0632)
- the Case Officer for the refused application stated that Barrington House is considered a ‘non-designated heritage asset’ noting that, ‘development of this particular site would be in conflict with planning policies.’
- It is also worth noting that the conservation officer who consulted on the original (refused) planning application to develop this exact site commented that ‘the grounds should be left to reflect how the house was once situated’.

- Additionally, one of the points of refusal cited in the previous failed application to develop this site, specifically advised the retention of ‘all existing’ boundaries and hedges. A portion of this site has recently been cleared by the applicant.
- The design of the development currently lacks many significant technical details relating to the precise height and slope of the solar panel structure, dimensions of the panels themselves and overall dimensions of the completed development.
- Moreover there are discrepancies within the few sets of details that have been included in this proposal. Drawing number B.035.25.02 shows 22 ground mounted solar panels covering the entire site, whereas drawing number B.035.25.01 shows 20 solar panels covering a smaller area of the site.
- The applicant, as earlier noted, has recently cleared an area of the site, which he assured us would be the full extent of the development. This area does not tally with either of the drawings included in the application. In short, it is impossible to ascertain the proposed final scale and impact of the development.
- No visual elevations have been provided to illustrate the impact of this proposal on the streetscape of Barrington Wood.
- The application for solar mounted panels is stated to be required in order to ‘service the dwelling’: there is no technical information provided to suggest that the scale of solar panels on the application is appropriate in this case.

However clear or otherwise this application is, our overriding conclusion is that this proposal should be refused.

It is entirely inappropriate to this sensitive site, due to:

- (i) its visual domination of the surroundings properties & streetscape and
- (ii) the site’s historical significance as part of the original garden of this ‘non-designated heritage asset’.

With regards,

