

M & J Design Services Limited

34 Eversfield
Southwater
West Sussex
RH13 9GF



Ms M. Bayliss
Horsham District Council.
Albury House,
Springfield Road,
Horsham,
West Sussex. RH12 2GB

5th January 2026.

Dear Ms Bayliss.

Ref: 18. Bethune Road, Horsham, West Sussex. RH13 5JP
Application No; DC/ 25/ 2039
Erection of a Two Storey Rear Extension.

Following inspection of the application on Horsham District Councils Planning Portal. The letter of objection from No 16. Bethune Road has been noted.

With regards to their comments regarding the possible loss of light to the East Facing First Floor window to the property's staircase and landing, I comment as follows.

I refer to the previous approval **DC/ 16/ 2033**, for a much larger two storey rear extension. Where the same objections were submitted from No 16.

Firstly, the latest proposal is of a lesser depth, 3.7m from the original rear building line, when compared to the previously approved 3.9m deep extension. The width of the latest proposal is again reduced to 4.2m when compared to the previously approved 7.48m. There are also, unlike the previous approved extension, no windows overlooking No 16.

I again refer to the previous approval **DC/ 16/ 2033**, and the comments contained within the Planning Officer's Report, under "Planning Assessment", specifically regarding adjacent Neighbor Impact for the larger extension.

"In terms of the impact of the proposed two storey extension on neighboring properties, these need to be carefully assessed. As mentioned above, No 20, has been extended at the rear at first floor level, and it is noted that the extension has been staggered to protect the 45-degree line on the habitable windows of No 18. The proposed extension at

No 18, whilst it would extend out further than No 20's extension, it would be a minimal increase which is considered to be acceptable and would not lessen the enjoyment of their residential amenities in terms of loss of light, privacy or outlook.

No 16, to the West is set further back from the road than the application property and the proposed extension would not extend out any further than the rear wall of No 16. Furthermore, the 1.5 meter gap to the side (common) boundary would be retained and No 16, also has a similar 1.5 meter gap to the side boundary. It is noted that there is a window proposed to, the side elevation of the application property at ground floor level to a Kitchen which would look out onto the 1.8 meter high boundary fence and blank wall of No 16. Whilst the first-floor windows would bring the rear elevation further out towards the garden the window nearest No 16 would be to a bathroom and would be obscure glazed.

*It is considered therefore in light of these circumstances, that **there would not be a significant material worsening of the existing relationship between the application site and No 16.** The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of the impact on neighbor amenity in terms of loss of light, privacy and outlook."*

The applicants of this proposal have considered both the latest and previous comments, concerns raised by No 16, and made compromises by reducing the overall size of the extension, both width and depth and by removing all windows overlooking No 16.

I hope all is clear, if you have any further comments or queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours Sincerely

