

From: Tracie Axford
Sent: 09 February 2026 12:00:46 UTC+00:00
To: "'Adam Humphrey'" <adam@mjhumphrey.co.uk>
Cc: "Western Road Hurstpierpoint (148)" <info@portlandproperties.co.uk>; "Mel Humphrey MRICS MBEng" <mel@mjhumphrey.co.uk>
Subject: RE: DM/25/3223 - 148 Western Road Hurstpierpoint

Dear Adam,

Following on from your email below, I have forwarded the details to my Team Leader and discussed the application with him. As for the reasons expressed in my previous email, it will still be recommended for refusal. I would also not recommend submitting any revisions as the previous application (DM/25/1337) which was approved, resulted in a proposal that was considered to be the maximum possible.

I appreciate that this decision will be disappointing and if you wish to do so then you can appeal to the Secretary of State under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. If you want to appeal against the local planning authority's decision then you must do so within 6 months (8 weeks in the case of advertisements, 12 weeks in the case of householder or minor commercial development) of the date of this notice *(see exceptions below).

Kind Regards
Tracie Axford

Please note that this advice is given at Officer level only and is without prejudice to the formal decision of the District Council.

Tracie Axford BSc (Hons) MSc
Planning Officer
Mid Sussex District Council, Oaklands Road
Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 1SS
01444 477325
tracie.axford@midsussex.gov.uk
www.midsussex.gov.uk



Working together for a better Mid Sussex

From: Adam Humphrey <adam@mjhumphrey.co.uk>
Sent: 04 February 2026 13:28
To: Tracie Axford <tracie.axford@midsussex.gov.uk>

Cc: Western Road Hurstpierpoint (148) <info@portlandproperties.co.uk>; Mel Humphrey
MRICS MBEng <mel@mjhumphrey.co.uk>

Subject: Re: DM/25/3223 - 148 Western Road Hurstpeirpoint

Hi Tracie,

Im kind of perplexed by the inconsistency between applications. This just seems nothing more than digging your heels in... to justify your last decision.

I attach 2 x screen shots.. massively disputing that 148 is more visible than that approved at 74 from Kemps road. From Kemps road I can see 10 plus rear dormers. One of which you have just approved. Due to the orientation and angle our proposal is massively masked on Sunleigh.

The previous permission doesnt mean we have to accept this as final. When you as the planning department have moved the goal posts by approving 74. The client didn't pay the fee to accept his previously permission for a second time. Surely on a human level you can see this.

It would be fair and reasonable to submit a scheme similar to 74 without the outrigger as this has been previously been approved at 74. I can do this for your formal consideration?

There are no objections to the proposal and the parish has recommended approval. Clearly you shouldn't bother consulting and just leave the decision to the conservation officer.

Have you carried out a formal site visit?

I dont often get emotional on applications, as we are always working a fine line of maintaining relationships with officers and the LA but the inconsistency as previously stated is staggering.

Please forward all of our correspondence to both your line manager and publish this on the portal so the inspectorate can clearly see our reasoning when appealing your decision if required.

Alternatively prior to issuing a decision would you give us the time to disuss with a councillor and get this to committee?

Kind Regards

Adam Humphrey, MCIOB BSc (Hons)

07812419142

adam@mjhumphrey.co.uk

21 Pendine Avenue
Worthing
West Sussex
BN11 2NA

M.J.Humphrey Ltd





On 4 Feb 2026, at 11:03, Tracie Axford <tracie.axford@midsussex.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Adam,

Thank you for your email below.

I apologise for the late response to your application, however I was waiting for the comments to come through from the conservation officer before coming back to you.

With regards to making revisions, we went through this when we were dealing with application DM/25/1337 and ended up with a scheme which was granted permission. This was a reduction from two small dormers, to one dormer and a rooflight. The current application is for a larger box dormer and we would not consider any revisions that are larger than the scheme permitted under DM/25/1337.

Each application is judged on its own merits. The position of 148 Western Road is different to no. 74 so they cannot be considered in the same manner. The rear of 148 is a lot more visible and is can be viewed from Sunleigh Court and the footpath beyond.

I have discussed your application with a team leader this morning who is in agreement with the decision to refuse this application. Therefore, the decision will be issued this week, unless you wish to withdraw the application.

Kind Regards
Tracie Axford

Please note that this advice is given at Officer level only and is without prejudice to the formal decision of the District Council.

Tracie Axford BSc (Hons) MSc
Planning Officer
Mid Sussex District Council, Oaklands Road
Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 1SS
01444 477325
tracie.axford@midsussex.gov.uk
www.midsussex.gov.uk

<image001.png>

Working together for a better Mid Sussex

From: Adam Humphrey <adam@mjhumphrey.co.uk>
Sent: 04 February 2026 07:24
To: Tracie Axford <Tracie.Axford@midsussex.gov.uk>
Cc: Western Road Hurstpierpoint (148) <info@portlandproperties.co.uk>; Mel Humphrey MRICS MBEng <mel@mjhumphrey.co.uk>
Subject: Re: DM/25/3223 - 148 Western Road Hurstpeirpoint

Hi Tracie,

Where as we welcome the conversation officers comments you are ultimately the planning officer on this application.

I would like to draw your attention to the following:

- Being given half a working day to respond having had radio silence is unacceptable.
- There is of course scope to revise the scheme. The client has paid an application fee, therefore a degree of due diligence and service is required.
- I agree it doesnt meet the design guide DG52, however I recommend looking at the recently approved at 74 wester road DM/25/2083 within

the same conservation area approved after the our previous application. This sets a precedent, same house, same street. Sunleigh court is not within the conservation area, and number 74 is still visible from kemps due to the corner, Same principle.

Officers comments from 74 Western Road that was approved.

"The scale and bulk of the proposed dormer window would not comply with the principles in 6.3.6, although it is noted that spacing will be retained to the ridge in particular, with modest spacing to oneside and the eaves. It will be no higher than the ridge of the rear wing, to which it will be affixed. It is noted that there are several existing box dormers of a similar scale and design, one immediately adjacent to the application property (no. 76) and at least three visible from its rear garden (nos. 68, 70 and 78). Rear box dormers are therefore not an uncommon feature to this particular area. Given this context (all being on properties that were originally similar to the application property), it is considered that the proposed dormer will be in keeping with its surroundings. It would co-ordinate with the existing building, and the proposed extension, being of matching materials. Only the side of the dormer would be visible from the street scene, and marginally so, which would be seen in context with the neighbouring dormer, so an additional one is unlikely to be harmful to this existing character. For these reasons, it is considered that the proposed dormer can be supported as it will be located at the rear of the property and not be harmful to the surrounding character. The rooflights are acceptable in their own right. On balance, therefore, the scheme is considered to comply with Policies DP26 and DP35 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policy HurstC4 of the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan, the Mid Sussex Design Guide (taken as a whole) and paragraph 210 of the NPPF."

In short there is a massive disparity in how these applications are being reviewed. One lead by a conservation officer and one a planning officer. The approved scheme at 74, Is viewed in context and in keeping with its surroundings. We are seeking to mirror that of the neighbours which in context is in keeping, we can of course revise the scheme if required to do so.

We would hate to appeal this application and have the decision over turned, something no one wants when we can get a workable approval with this application.

Kind Regards

Adam Humphrey, MCIOB BSc (Hons)

07812419142

adam@mjhumphrey.co.uk

21 Pendine Avenue
Worthing
West Sussex
BN11 2NA

M.J.Humphrey Ltd

On 3 Feb 2026, at 16:13, Mel Humphrey MRICS MBEng
<mel@mjhumphrey.co.uk> wrote:

Adam

FYI

M.J.Humphrey Ltd
Mel Humphrey RICS C.Build E MCABE
9 Aldsworth Avenue
Goring By Sea
West Sussex
BN12 4XQ

07701055182

On 3 Feb 2026, at 14:09, Tracie Axford
<Tracie.Axford@midsussex.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Mel Humphrey,

I am writing to you with regards to the above referenced application. I have now received the comments from the conservation officer and uploaded them to the online register. Unfortunately, the conservation officer is not able to support this application, nor does she recommend the submission of revisions as we have already been through

this with the previous application for this property. Please see her comments below:

148 Western Road is an unlisted semi-detached house located to the western side of Western Road within the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area. The house is one half of a handed pair of late 19th/early 20th century villas, typical of the period and style of development within this part of the recently extended Conservation Area. It retains a number of attractive period features, and makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Area. It is unusual in being relatively open to view from the rear, from the adjacent road leading off Western Road, Sunleigh Court, which is also a public right of way (PROW).

Planning permission was recently granted for a loft conversion including a rear dormer window and rooflight, and two rooflights to the front roof slope. This permission was secured following revisions to the originally submitted scheme, which was for two rear dormers. This first scheme received an adverse response based on the scale and unsympathetic design of the dormer windows, which were considered to detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and to be contrary to the requirements of the Council's adopted Design Guide.

The current application is also for a loft conversion, but to include box dormer extensions to the rear of the house, sitting across the rear roof slope and along the north facing slope of the existing rear wing's roof.

This proposal is considered unacceptable in principle due to the scale and design of the dormer additions. These would appear unduly bulky and visually prominent in views of buildings from the rear, including from Sunleigh Court and the PROW which runs along it. The form and design of the dormer windows is also unsympathetic to the existing building. This would detract from the contribution which the house makes to the character and appearance of the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area, contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35. In terms of the NPPF, the proposal will result in less than substantial harm to the heritage asset, at around the mid-level of that scale, such that the balancing exercise set out in paragraph 215 will apply.

The proposal is also contrary to the requirements of the Council's adopted Design Guide, specifically Design

Principle DG52 Loft Conversions and Roof Extensions and paragraphs 6.3.5 and 6.3.8.

Although the principle of a loft conversion is not contentious, given that there is an extant planning permission to allow for this and including what would be, in my opinion, the maximum possible extension to the rear of the roof (in the form of the approved dormer window) I would suggest that encouraging revisions to the current application will not be productive.

In light of these comments, I would recommend this application for refusal. If you would like to withdraw this application, then please let me know by tomorrow at 14:00 and I will get the application withdrawn. If you have any further questions, then please let me know.

Kind Regards
Tracie

Please note that this advice is given at Officer level only and is without prejudice to the formal decision of the District Council.

Tracie Axford BSc (Hons) MSc
Planning Officer
Mid Sussex District Council, Oaklands Road
Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 1SS
01444 477325
tracie.axford@midsussex.gov.uk
www.midsussex.gov.uk

<image001.png>

Working together for a better Mid Sussex

The information contained in this email may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Unless the information contained in this email is legally exempt from disclosure, we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this email to a third party making a request for information about the subject matter of this email. This email and any attachments may contain confidential information and is intended only to be seen and used by the named addressees. If you are not the named addressee, any use, disclosure, copying, alteration or forwarding of this email and its attachments is unauthorised. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately by email or by calling +44 (0) 1444 458 166 and

remove this email and its attachments from your system. The views expressed within this email and any attachments are not necessarily the views or policies of Mid Sussex District Council. We have taken precautions to minimise the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we advise you to carry out your own virus checks before accessing this email and any attachments. Except where required by law, we shall not be responsible for any damage, loss or liability of any kind suffered in connection with this email and any attachments, or which may result from reliance on the contents of this email and any attachments.

The information contained in this email may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Unless the information contained in this email is legally exempt from disclosure, we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this email to a third party making a request for information about the subject matter of this email. This email and any attachments may contain confidential information and is intended only to be seen and used by the named addressees. If you are not the named addressee, any use, disclosure, copying, alteration or forwarding of this email and its attachments is unauthorised. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately by email or by calling +44 (0) 1444 458 166 and remove this email and its attachments from your system. The views expressed within this email and any attachments are not necessarily the views or policies of Mid Sussex District Council. We have taken precautions to minimise the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we advise you to carry out your own virus checks before accessing this email and any attachments. Except where required by law, we shall not be responsible for any damage, loss or liability of any kind suffered in connection with this email and any attachments, or which may result from reliance on the contents of this email and any attachments.