

Horsham District Council

Ref: 190/2026
Date: 4 September 2026

Dear Sir or Madam,

Re: Planning Application DC/26/0980 - Blenheim Rise, Lower Street, Pulborough, West Sussex RH20 2AA

Proposal: Demolition of existing summer house and erection of a summer house and two composite deck areas

I write on behalf of the occupant of No. 3 Glebelands to object formally to planning application DC/26/0980. Their property is a neighbouring dwelling situated to the east of the application site, northeast of 1 Glebelands, and would be materially affected by the proposal.

This objection concerns the effect of the raised decking, associated summer house, privacy screen and elevated gravel access route on the occupant's residential amenity. The principal harm arises from the marked difference in levels between the two sites, the resulting direct views into three bedrooms at No. 3 Glebelands and the inability to provide screening without creating an unacceptable structure.

Overbearing Impact

The proposal introduces extensive raised structures into a sloping garden above No. 3 Glebelands. The neighbouring property sits in a pronounced dip, so the decking and walkway would be experienced from substantially below their finished levels. This topographical relationship materially increases their apparent height, visual dominance and effect on the occupant's outlook.

The decking, balustrading, summer house and privacy screen would be experienced together as a substantial and visually prominent built form. When viewed from No. 3 Glebelands, this combination would have an oppressive and overbearing effect, materially diminishing the occupant's outlook and enjoyment of their home and garden.

The second composite deck area shown close to the eastern boundary requires particular weight. It would create a permanent elevated recreational surface where people could sit or stand close to No. 3 Glebelands. Its proximity and elevation would intensify both the overbearing effect and direct views into the three bedroom windows. This deck must be lowered to natural ground level or formed as a genuinely terraced area that does not create raised sightlines.

The difference in levels also means that any screen capable of preventing views into the three affected bedrooms would need to be approximately 4m high when assessed from the level of No. 3 Glebelands. A screen of that height would be a major and visually harmful structure. The proposal therefore presents an unavoidable conflict: a lower screen would not protect privacy, while an effective screen would itself be unacceptably overbearing.

The submitted drawings do not provide a sufficiently clear contextual section showing the proposed development in relation to the dip in which No. 3 Glebelands sits, its three affected bedroom windows or its private garden. In the absence of verified finished platform and walkway levels and an accurate contextual section, the authority cannot reliably determine the proposal's visual and overbearing effect on the occupant's property.

Loss of Privacy and Overlooking

The raised decking would create an elevated outdoor recreational area from which users would have direct views toward No. 3 Glebelands and into three bedroom windows. The concern is not limited to occasional or distant views. The platform would allow people to

stand, sit and gather at an elevated level, creating sustained sightlines into rooms where the occupant has the highest reasonable expectation of privacy.

The position of No. 3 Glebelands in a dip is central to the assessment. Users of the proposed decking and walkway would be raised well above the level of the neighbouring house and garden. Ordinary boundary treatment would therefore sit below the relevant sightlines and would not prevent overlooking into the three bedrooms.

This would result in direct overlooking and an unacceptable perception of being overlooked. It would materially harm the privacy and residential amenity presently enjoyed by the occupant of No. 3 Glebelands. The authority's assessment should take account of the ordinary and reasonably foreseeable use of the decking for sitting, socialising and recreation, rather than treating it merely as a physical structure.

Privacy Screening Cannot Mitigate the Harm

Drawing A.101 appears to show a 2m high privacy screen beside only part of the proposed development. Given the lower level of No. 3 Glebelands, a screen of that height would not interrupt the elevated sightlines from the decking and gravel walkway into the three bedroom windows.

The occupant estimates that effective screening would need to be approximately 4m high when viewed from No. 3 Glebelands. Such a structure would be disproportionate, visually intrusive and overbearing. No realistically acceptable boundary screen can therefore remedy the privacy harm caused by retaining the platform and walkway at their proposed levels.

A substantial mature soft-landscaped buffer across the full eastern boundary should be a baseline requirement for any fundamentally redesigned proposal, particularly because established screening was previously removed. Planting cannot, however, grow quickly or reliably enough to prevent the direct elevated views created by the current platform and walkway. It is therefore not mitigation for the development now before the authority.

The privacy impact of the current proposal cannot be made acceptable through screening. The raised elements must be removed or reduced to eliminate the harmful sightlines at source. The application should therefore be refused or withdrawn for fundamental redesign.

Gravel Access Path and Intensified Use

The proposed gravel route is an elevated walkway serving the decking and summer house. It is not merely an incidental landscape feature; it forms the principal circulation route through the upper part of the garden and brings users closer to the eastern boundary overlooking No. 3 Glebelands.

The walkway would be even more harmful to privacy than the raised platform because everyone accessing the upper area would use it. People walking along this route would have direct sightlines into three bedroom windows at No. 3 Glebelands. The frequency and proximity of those views would cause a serious and continuing loss of privacy.

Screening the walkway would require a structure approximately 4m high when assessed from No. 3 Glebelands and would create an unacceptable visual barrier. The elevated gravel walkway should therefore be removed entirely from the submission. Access to the upper garden should be relocated to another part of the site, away from the eastern boundary.

Any assessment of overlooking must therefore consider the complete arrangement, including the eastern composite deck, the steps, the elevated gravel walkway and the summer house. The privacy harm cannot be assessed by considering the proposed 2m screen at a single point in isolation.

Insufficient Information

The application should not be approved without clear information establishing:

- the existing and proposed ground, decking and walkway levels;

- the finished height of each deck area and the elevated gravel walkway;
- the relationship between those levels, the dip at No. 3 Glebelands and its bedroom windows;
- the separation between the eastern composite deck, the gravel walkway, the boundary and No. 3 Glebelands;
- the sightlines from the decking and walkway into the three affected bedroom windows; and
- the existing and proposed landscaping along the full eastern boundary.

Without this information, the authority cannot safely conclude that the development would preserve the residential amenity of the occupant of No. 3 Glebelands.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the proposal would cause material and unmitigable harm to the residential amenity of the occupant of No. 3 Glebelands through its overbearing visual impact, direct overlooking into three bedrooms and the intensified use of elevated areas close to the eastern boundary.

On behalf of the occupant, I respectfully request that planning permission be refused. Alternatively, the applicant should withdraw the application and submit a fundamentally redesigned scheme.

The identified harm cannot be cured by minor amendments. Any acceptable redesign would, as a minimum, need to:

- lower the raised platform to natural ground level, or form it as a terraced area that does not create raised sightlines toward the bedroom windows at No. 3 Glebelands;
- remove the elevated gravel walkway entirely and relocate access to the upper garden away from the eastern boundary; and

- provide a substantial mature soft-landscaped buffer across the full eastern boundary to replace the screening previously removed.

These requirements are expressed strictly without prejudice to the primary objection. In particular, the proposed landscaped buffer is not advanced as mitigation for the current raised platform or elevated walkway and should not be treated as a basis for approving the current application. It would become relevant only after those harmful elements had been removed and the scheme fundamentally redesigned.

Please record this letter as a formal objection on behalf of the occupant of No. 3 Glebelands and take these material planning considerations into account when determining application DC/26/0980.

Yours faithfully



Doug Wright

WPS Planning

For and on behalf of the occupant of No. 3 Glebelands