

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk <Planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Sent: 29 May 2026 09:47:24 UTC+01:00
To: "Planning" <planning@horsham.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/26/0739
Categories: Comments Received

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 29/05/2026 9:47 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	21 Whytings Mannings Heath West Sussex RH13 6JZ
Proposal:	Erection of a first floor side extension.
Case Officer:	Meg Bayliss

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	19 Whytings Mannings Heath Horsham West Sussex
----------	--

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Neighbour
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	- Design - Loss of General Amenity - Overdevelopment - Privacy Light and Noise
Comments:	I object to the proposed first-floor side extension at 21 Whytings and ask that planning permission is refused. My objection is not based on opposition to house extensions in principle. It is based on the specific physical relationship between the property at 21 Whytings and my property, 19 Whytings. The applicant's case relies heavily on the existence of other first-

floor side extensions in Whytings and nearby. However, those examples are not directly comparable. The key issue in this case is that No. 21 sits materially forward of No. 19, creating a different and more harmful physical relationship than would exist between two normally aligned neighbouring houses.

The submitted block plan shows the relationship between Nos. 19 and 21 and the proposed side extension area. It demonstrates that the proposed first-floor extension would be on the side of No. 21 closest to No. 19, in a position where the two properties are offset rather than aligned. This offset is important because it means the proposal would affect No. 19 differently from a similar extension on a more normally aligned plot.

The proposed elevations show that the development would create a substantial first-floor side extension over the existing garage and side area. Although the roof form is designed to match the existing dwelling, the proposal would materially increase the two-storey bulk on the side of No. 21 facing No. 19.

Because No. 21 is positioned forward of No. 19, this additional upper-floor mass would not sit neutrally alongside our property. It would project into the forward outlook from No. 19 and would appear dominant and overbearing when viewed from our front bedrooms, driveway, front approach and principal frontage. This is not simply a street-scene concern. It directly affects the outlook and living conditions of No. 19.

The applicant's own submitted photo pack is useful in showing this physical relationship. It includes a photograph labelled "FRONT ELEVATION of 19 Whytings and SIDE ELEVATION of 21 Whytings". This image clearly demonstrates that the side elevation of No. 21 forms part of the direct outlook from the front of No. 19. The proposed extension would increase the height and mass of that already prominent side elevation, making the relationship more enclosed, dominant and overbearing.

The application also seeks to rely on examples of other extensions at 7 Whytings, 9 Whytings, 24 Whytings, 26 Whytings and Conifers in Pound Lane. The proposed elevation drawing itself refers to other permitted house extensions and states that the ridge line would be similar to existing ridge lines on those properties. However, the presence of similar extensions elsewhere does not address the specific planning issue in this case. Those examples do not demonstrate that the same physical relationship exists between the host dwelling and its neighbour. The important point here is the site-specific impact on No. 19 caused by the offset between Nos. 19 and 21.

I therefore do not consider the cited examples to be directly comparable. The architectural form may be similar, but the impact is materially different because No. 21 sits forward of No. 19. A

similar extension on an aligned plot may have a very different effect from the same extension in this location.

I am also concerned about loss of light and increased overshadowing. The proposed roof plan confirms that the roof mass would extend over the existing side and garage area. Given the forward position of No. 21 relative to No. 19, the additional two-storey mass would reduce the current openness and daylight experienced from the front and side of our property. This is particularly relevant to our front bedroom outlook and the driveway and front approach area.

There is also a privacy concern. The proposed side elevation includes a new first-floor side-facing window, described as obscure glazed. The application form also states that the side elevation window would be obscured glazing. However, because of the offset between the two properties, this side-facing first-floor relationship is sensitive. From our front bedroom, the side elevation of No. 21 and its existing side window are already visible. The proposed extension would bring the first-floor side relationship closer to our bedroom outlook, increasing the perception of overlooking and reducing privacy within a private habitable room.

The proposed first-floor plan shows that the extension would create additional bedroom and en-suite accommodation and includes the side-facing window within the new extension area. If the Council is minded to approve the application, then at minimum any side-facing first-floor window should be conditioned to remain obscure glazed and non-opening below 1.7 metres above finished floor level, and no additional side-facing windows should be inserted without further planning permission. However, such conditions would not overcome my primary objection regarding the overbearing impact and loss of outlook caused by the additional two-storey mass.

In summary, I ask that the application is refused because No. 21 sits materially forward of No. 19, creating a sensitive offset between the two properties. The proposed first-floor side extension would introduce additional two-storey bulk directly into the outlook from No. 19. The proposal would appear dominant and overbearing from our front bedrooms, driveway, front approach and principal frontage. The proposal would reduce openness and daylight to the front and side of our property. The proposed side-facing first-floor window creates a privacy concern due to the offset between the two properties. The other extensions cited by the applicant are not directly comparable unless they share the same neighbour relationship and impact, which has not been demonstrated.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that Horsham District Council refuses the application.

Kind regards

Telephone:

Email: planning@horsham.gov.uk



Horsham District Council, Alberty House, Springfield Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2GB
Telephone: 01403 215100 (calls may be recorded) www.horsham.gov.uk Chief Executive: Jane Eaton