**From:** Planning@horsham.gov.uk
**Sent:** 27 May 2024 15:30
**To:** Planning
**Subject:** Comments for Planning Application DC/24/0752

**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 27/05/2024 3:29 PM.

## Application Summary

| | |
|---|---|
| Address: | Chalk Hills Sopers Lane Bramber West Sussex BN44 3PU |
| Proposal: | Variation of condition 1 of planning permission DC/23/0615 (Erection of a first-floor extension over existing garage and addition of ground floor bay windows and extension of first floor balcony to the rear) relating to changes to some windows and finishes. |
| Case Officer: | Shazia Penne |

Click for further information

## Customer Details

| | |
|---|---|
| Address: | Hadleigh Sopers Lane Steyning |

## Comments Details

| | |
|---|---|
| Commenter Type: | Neighbour |
| Stance: | Customer objects to the Planning Application |
| Reasons for comment: | - Design<br>- Loss of General Amenity<br>- Privacy Light and Noise |
| Comments: | We are the owners of Hadleigh, the house to the west of the application site. We did not object to the original application for planning permission (which was granted on 14 July 2023). Although we were concerned about the bulk of the first floor extension, so near to our own house, we were very much reassured by the fact that the then proposed western elevation had been deliberately designed so that it did not include any windows which overlooked our house - see the original plan 2307/8. The reasonableness of our attitude was supported by the officer's assessment dated 14 July 2023 who specifically noted that no first floor windows were proposed to the side elevation of the addition. In addition, no windows were proposed to the existing ground floor beneath the first floor extension.<br>We were concerned in April 2024 when we saw that the house which was being constructed departed from the permitted plans by including three windows in the west elevation |

overlooking our property. The adjoining owner/developer had not told us of the intention to depart from the permitted plans. This departure was wholly contrary to the basis on which the original planning permission had been obtained. We then discovered that the adjoining owner/developer had made an inappropriate application to obtain approval to the new plans on the basis that the new plans dealt with reserved matters. We (rightly) pointed out that this part of the application was invalid. We were nonetheless concerned that the invalid application had been made as we were not entitled to be consulted in relation to it.
The adjoining owner/developer has now made a valid application seeking approval for three new windows in the west elevation - see the revised plan 2307/8A. We have been consulted in relation to this application. Plan 2307/8A shows window W12. However, the new extension is being constructed without window W12 and accordingly, W12 should not be approved. We note that W12 is said to use obscure glass - that was the not the case with the earlier invalid application where there was no restriction to obscure glass.
We object to the grant of permission to a glazed door (D2) and a new window at W6. The glazing of the door and W6 is not obscure. This door and window will look onto the balcony which adjoins our kitchen and would involve a loss of amenity for us, to which we object. The planning authority should impose a condition that this door and window be of obscure glass (or, in the case of the door, not glazed but of solid construction, as would be typical for a garage door. That condition would reflect the basis on which the original planning permission was obtained.

---

Kind regards