

From: planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk <planninginfo@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 April 2026 08:25:30 UTC+01:00
To: "Andrew Horrell" <andrew.horrell@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: Mid Sussex DC - Online Register - Comments for Planning Application
DM/25/2069

Comments summary

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Comments were submitted at 13/04/2026 8:25 AM.

Application Summary

Address:	St Johns Lodge 151 High Street Lindfield Haywards Heath West Sussex RH16 2HT
Proposal:	Replace later addition rear extension with new single storey extension. Installation of bay window to western elevation including internal alterations. Demolish later addition garage and erect new single bay garage to rear garden with associate landscaping works. (amended plans received 16/03 and amended description 20/03)
Case Officer:	Andrew Horrell

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address:	36 High Street Lindfield Haywards Heath
----------	---

Comments Details

Commenter Type:	Local amenity society or association
Stance:	Customer objects to the Planning Application
Reasons for comment:	
Comments:	The Lindfield Society have concerns about some of the proposals contained in this application, most notably the scale and form of the extension to the north elevation. Not only does the footprint of this extension appear excessive when compared with the existing Listed building but the

trapezoidal plan form creates a very awkward relationship between extension and existing building on the north-east side. In the Society's opinion the extension would have a less detrimental effect on the existing Listed building if it were orthogonal in plan and its overall width did not exceed the width of the existing 20th-century infill extension.

That said, the Society believes that the contrasting aesthetic illustrated in the image contained in the Design and Access statement is appropriate and works well. There does, however, appear to be a difference between the stone walls shown here and those shown on the elevational drawings, where they appear to be drawn as less attractive brickwork with traditional bonding and described as 'rough faced Sussex stone finish'.

On the west elevation, in addition to the comments made by the Conservation Officer regarding the introduction of two bay windows, which the Society agrees with, the Society also believes that more attention is required to the relationship between any extension to the north. If the walls of the extension are to align with the existing building there should either be greater continuity of wall finishes or a clear 'separation' detail introduced.

John Dawson
Lindfield Society

Kind regards