

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 July 2026 17:23
To: Planning
Subject: * PLEASE COMBINE PHOTOS FROM EMAILS ABOVE WITH THIS COMMENT*
Objection to Planning reference DC/26/0957

Categories: Comments Received

[REDACTED]

**Apple Tree Cottage
Littleworth Lane
Partridge Green
West Sussex
RH13 8JF**

Dear Sir/Madam

**Planning reference: DC/26/0957
The Cottage, Littleworth Lane, Partridge Green RH13 8JF**

Reason for comment:
Design
Loss of General Amenity
Overdevelopment

We object to the planning application. While slight adjustments have been made to our neighbours' original plans we continue to have three main concerns regarding:

1. Ridge height of southern extension

We wonder why the proposed ground floor southern extension needs to be so high? At the ridge it appears to be approximately 1 metre higher than our sunroom extension. As the proposed extension is set only one metre from our boundary a build of this height and scale would look and feel overbearing to us, viewing it from our garden and our first floor windows. The ground level next door is elevated by approximately 25 cm compared with our plot and this would further add to the overbearing height of the proposed extension. Being positioned so close to our sunroom extension, it would also look out of proportion when viewed from our garden and windows. We consider the design of the proposed southern extension would be detrimental to the general amenity of our property.

Please see **Photo 1** showing view from our bedroom window and the current twin garages which are to be demolished and replaced with a much higher and longer building, the front of which will be almost level with the bedroom window. This shows how overbearing and obtrusive the proposed extension roof would be. It would feel claustrophobic to us and spoil the feeling of living in an open countryside setting.

Our sunroom extension, which is approximately 1 metre lower in height has a vaulted ceiling which gives a very airy, light spacious feeling inside (please see **Photo 2**). Could the roof angle of the proposed southern extension be reduced to lower the height of the ridge?

Please refer to our annotated drawing, **Fig. 1 WEST ELEVATION** showing part of our existing sunroom extension in relation to the proposed extension. The angle of our sunroom roof has been drawn onto the proposed extension roof and clearly shows the difference in ridge height.

It is proposed that Solar panels are to be fitted to the roof of the southern extension. After carrying out research apparently solar panels in West Sussex work best when set at an angle of 30 degrees if the panels are facing south. Therefore, if the ridge height is lowered, as shown in the drawing, a 30-degree angle can be achieved. The 'x' on the drawing indicates a compromise height between the proposed ridge height and our sunroom extension ridge height.

2. Close proximity of the proposed extension to our house

We understand from the owners of the property that they may require wheelchairs in later life and they wish to plan ahead for this. They say this is the reason for their need for the southern extension having a link extension (covered passageway) from the original Edwardian cottage to the contemporary extension for manoeuvring wheelchairs and also the parking of a wheelchair, as stated in the Planning, Design and Access Statement.

We are concerned about the width of the link extension (covered passageway) between the original cottage and the separate southern extension. Because of the considerable width of this covered passageway the southern extension would be very close to our boundary which would affect the amenity of our property. Our sunroom extension was built only 20cm from the boundary which means the proposed extension would be even closer to us than would normally be the case.

Detached properties in the hamlet of Littleworth have large gaps between houses, even when extensions are added on. The proposed extension is positioned very close to our property and represents overdevelopment as it doesn't respect the character of the neighbourhood.

Perhaps this covered passageway could be adjusted to a shorter width with the distance from the front to the back of the passageway increased to compensate and allow the necessary space for manoeuvring wheelchairs and storing a wheelchair (we suggest if another wheelchair needs to be stored it could be stored in the original cottage, under the new dog-leg staircase). This would then enable the extension to be set 2 metres from the boundary.

Please refer to **Fig. 2** where the drawing has been amended to show how this is possible.

Also see **Fig. 1 EAST ELEVATION** and comments.

The design statement states the gap between the existing cottage and the proposed southern extension is narrower than the gap between the existing cottage and the twin garages. However, we are concerned about the height and larger size of the proposed extension compared with the current twin garages. The close proximity of the large proposed extension would affect the general amenity of our property.

See **Photo 3** of our sunroom extension showing the area next door where the southern extension is proposed, replacing the twin garages.

3. Concerns over extension having additional storey added and/or being converted to a separate dwelling in future

The southern extension is like a separate building from the original cottage, linked only by the covered passageway. We wonder why the southern extension cannot be simply added on to the original cottage in the same way that the west facing extension is being added. There would then be no need for the covered passageway.

The current owners have assured us they do not intend to make the southern extension two storeys in height in the future or to subdivide it from the original house to create a separate dwelling. However, situations change over the years, and a future owner of the house could apply for planning permission to add another storey to the extension and/or remove the link (covered passageway). The extension could then be made into a separate dwelling because it is some distance from the original cottage. If this were to be approved it would severely affect the amenity of our house in terms of being overbearing, causing loss of privacy, overlooking, noise and light pollution. We would request that the distance between the original cottage and the extension is reduced as much as possible, to ensure there is less likelihood of the extension being made into two separate dwellings in the future.

We realise that to add another storey onto the extension or to make it a separate dwelling would require a separate planning application. However, there is obviously no guarantee that planning permission would never be granted for either or both of these scenarios.

We hope you will be sympathetic regarding our concerns and that they will be taken into consideration. We also hope that the amendments we have suggested will be considered favourably.

We are sending a total of 5 attachments, 2 with this e-mail and others to follow.

Yours faithfully

A black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.



PHOTO 1 DC12610957



PHOTO 2 2012/09/27



PHOTO 3 DC/26/0957