

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/0648	Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Demolition of existing detached garage and rear infill extension, proposed new two-storey pitched roof side extension.		
Site:	61 Turners Mill Road, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 1NH, , , ,		
Validation Date	12 Mar 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	7 Apr 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Refusal	Recommendation Date:	7 May 2025
Target Date:	7 May 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Stefan Galyas</i>

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	0
--	--	-------------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	7 May 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/0648

**61 Turners Mill Road, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 1NH, , ,
Demolition of existing detached garage and rear infill extension, proposed new two-storey
pitched roof side extension.
Mr And Mrs Payne**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

There were no letters of representation received in response to the current proposal.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Naturespace District Licensing:

No objection.

Southern Water:

No objection

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No comment.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for the development of a two-storey side extension as well as the demolition of the existing single storey garage outbuilding and for the removal of the single storey rear extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

CU/365/83 - Proposed Garage. Permission 12.01.1984.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application relates to 61 Turners Mill Road, a two-storey detached property set to the southern corner of the junction between Turners Mill Close to the north and Turners Mill Road to the east. The existing dwelling is set back from the highway edge by a front driveway and accompanying front garden amenity space. The existing dwelling has been extended and altered over time through the addition of single storey flat roofed rear (west) extensions, the addition of a rear dormer and the erection of a detached single storey garage outbuilding to the side (north). The site is afforded garden amenity space to the rear which rises up in natural ground level, with the neighbouring site at 1 Turners Mill Road positioned towards the rear boundary. The existing dwelling is composed of rendering at ground floor level and tile hanging at first floor, concrete pantiles with half round ridge and hip tiles and white uPVC windows and doors.

With regard to the sites locality, there are predominantly two storey detached properties with tile hanging at first floor level featuring predominantly. There is some variance in external materials which adds further visual interest throughout the street scene.

The site is within the built-up area for Haywards Heath as defined in the District Plan (DP).

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposal would demolish the existing single storey rear (west) elevation extension and the side (north) elevation detached outbuilding. In its place the proposal would develop a two-storey side extension. The side extension would measure at approximately 8.8m in length, 4.4m wide, have an eaves height of 4.9m high and a ridge height measuring at 7.5m. In terms of external materials, the extension would use rendering at ground floor level and clay tile hanging at first floor, concrete pantiles with half round ridge and hip tiles, polyester powder coated aluminium frames and white uPVC windows and polyester powder coated aluminium doors.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND LIST OF POLICIES

Planning legislation holds that the determination of a planning application shall be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Using this as the starting point the development plan for this part of Mid Sussex consists of the District Plan, Site Allocation Development Plan Document (DPD) and the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan

National policy (which is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy Guidance) does not form part of the development plan but is an important material consideration.

Mid Sussex District Plan

The District Plan was adopted at Full Council on 28th March 2018.

Relevant policies:

DP26: Character and Design

Site Allocations DPD

The SADPD was adopted on 29th June 2022. It allocates sufficient housing and employment land to meet identified needs to 2031.

There are no relevant policies.

Neighbourhood Plan

Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan (Made March 2016)

Policy E9 - Protection and Reinforcement of Local Character

Policy H9 - Domestic Extensions

The District Council is reviewing and updating the District Plan. Upon adoption, the new District Plan 2021 - 2039 will replace the current District Plan 2014-2031 and its policies will have full weight. In accordance with the NPPF, Local Planning Authorities may give weight to relevant policies of the emerging plan according to the stage of preparation; the extent to which there are unresolved objections to the relevant policies; and the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the NPPF. The draft District Plan 2021-2039 (Regulation 19) is currently at Examination and stage 1 hearings were concluded on the 31st October 2024. There are unresolved objections to some of the Policies in the draft District Plan and as such, only minimal weight can be given to the Plan and this planning application has been assessed against the policies of the adopted District Plan.

Relevant policies:

DPS1 - Climate Change

DPS2 - Sustainable Design and Construction

DPB1 - Character and Design

Mid Sussex Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

The Council has adopted a 'Mid Sussex Design Guide' SPD that aims to help deliver high quality development across the district that responds appropriately to its context and is inclusive and sustainable. The Design Guide was adopted by Council on 4th November 2020 as an SPD for use in the consideration and determination of planning applications. The SPD is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 is a material consideration. Paragraphs 2, 8, 11, 39, 48, 131, 135 & 139.

National Design Guide (Published January 2021)

ASSESSMENT

It is considered that the main issues that need to be considered in the determination of this application are as follows;

- Design and Character
- Impact on Neighbouring Amenities
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Design and Character

DP26 of the District Plan states:

'All development and surrounding spaces, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings and replacement dwellings, will be well designed and reflect the distinctive character of the towns and villages while being sensitive to the countryside. All applicants will be required to demonstrate that development:

- o is of high-quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace;*
- o contributes positively to, and clearly defines, public and private realms and should normally be designed with active building frontages facing streets and public open spaces to animate and provide natural surveillance;*
- o creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape;*
- o protects open spaces, trees and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;*
- o does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings, including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight, and noise, air and light pollution'*

Furthermore, Policy H9 of the Neighbourhood Plan states that:

Extensions to existing dwellings will be permitted where it meets the following criteria:

- o The scale, height and form fit unobtrusively with the existing building and the character of the street scene.*
- o Spacing between buildings would respect the character of the street scene.*
- o Gaps which provide views out to surrounding countryside are maintained.*
- o Materials are compatible with the materials of the existing building.*
- o The traditional boundary treatment of an area is retained and, where feasible reinforced.*
- o The privacy, daylight, sunlight and outlook of adjoining residents are safeguarded.*

Policy E10 of the Neighbourhood Plan notes that:

Development proposals in an Area of Townscape Character will be required to pay particular attention to retaining the special character and to demonstrate how they support and enhance the character of the area in question.

Principle DG49 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide states:

'Extensions should typically use simple, uncomplicated building forms to compliment and coordinate with the scale, form and massing of the original dwelling. The design approach may benefit from coordinating with the existing pattern of window and door openings as well as employing facing materials to match those of the existing dwelling. Otherwise, it should demonstrate the appropriateness of the alternative approach.'

Principle DG50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide elaborates further on what constitutes 'good design' in relation to side extensions:

Side extensions should normally be subservient to the original dwelling and typically be set-back from the front of the house to help define the original building.

The gaps between dwellings can sometimes positively contribute to articulating (for example, through the consistent rhythm of repeated houses) and adding interest in a street frontage or by providing views / visible connections to the surrounding countryside. Side extensions will therefore need to appropriately respond to the character of the street form and will not normally be accepted where they close an important gap and view.

The National Design Guide (2021) states in Paragraph 44 that:

"to communicate the benefits of a scheme, it is important to explain how the design of a development relates to context and local character." It adds that

"well-designed places and buildings are influenced positively by:

- o The history and heritage of the site, its surroundings and the wider area, including cultural influences;*
- o The significance and setting of heritage assets and any other specific features that merit conserving and enhancing;*
- o The local vernacular, including historical building typologies such as the terrace, town house, mews, villa or mansion block, the treatment of facades, characteristic materials and details"* (Paragraph 46).

The existing property is sited within a corner plot in the southern corner of the junction between Turners Mill Road and Turners Hill Road. Views towards the application property are considered to be further increased due to the properties position at a higher topographical level when compared to the roadside as the land rises upwards along the front garden and driveway. It is also considered that there is a substantial offset at present between the main two storey built form and the roadside to the north, this is considered to be reflected at 63 to the northern side of the junction which also is offset from the side boundary.

With regard to the proposed two storey extension, this is considered to increase the two-storey built form to the side of the existing property whilst matching the existing dwellings ridge height. The proposal would extend slightly forward of the principal elevation and behind the rear elevation. The extension is considered to be read as an additional 'wing' to the dwelling, lacking any subservience towards the existing.

It is considered that the proposed front gable would overwhelm the existing dwelling and be read as the primary feature along the principal elevation. Furthermore, when viewed from Turners Mill Road looking to the south-east, it is considered that the proposed rear hipped projection would be of an overly dominant appearance. The side extension would still project for some 2.4m out into the rear garden, further increasing the overall bulk, scale and form of the development.

With regard to the sites locality, a number of properties have been previously extended in varying forms, such as at 57 and 65 Turners Mill Road. Whilst each planning application is assessed based on its own merits, these previous extensions will have been assessed prior to the adoption of the Councils Design Guide. The application site is considered to be within a wholly different context with its corner plot location offering substantial views towards the entire side elevation. Furthermore, the offset from the side (northern) boundary in two storey built form is considered to be mirrored by the other corner plot to the northern side of the junction at 63. These gaps are considered to serve value in breaking up the built

form along the street scene and entrance to Turners Mill Close. As such, the proposed extension would enclose this and present a dominant feature towards the streetscene.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed two storey side extension would overwhelm the existing dwelling and appear overly dominant within its immediate context. Views towards the side elevation would be further enhanced due to the properties siting within a corner plot, thus increasing the level of harm. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with the provisions of DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Principle DG50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide, the National Design Guide and Paragraph 135 of the NPPF.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenities

Policy H9 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan states that proposals should 'safeguard' neighbouring amenities with regard to privacy, daylight, sunlight and outlook whereas policy DP26 of the MSDP states that development should not cause 'significant harm' to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings, including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight, and noise, air and light pollution. There is therefore some conflict between the District Plan and Neighbourhood Plan in this respect. Under section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 if a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan, the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approved or published. As such, Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan is considered to take precedence and therefore the test in this instance is whether the development causes 'significant harm' to neighbouring amenities as outlined above.

There would be a new first floor en-suite window added to the rear (western) elevation of the proposal which would face out towards the neighbouring property at 1 Turners Mill Close. The neighbouring dwelling to the north has two ground floor side (eastern) elevation windows one of which serves as a primary window to a 'snug' and the other as a secondary window to a reception. There is also a side (eastern) facing rooflight at the neighbouring dwelling. A distance in excess of 14m would remain between the proposed en-suite window and the neighbouring windows which are obscured by the existing boundary fencing and hedgerow between the sites. As such, it is not considered that the proposed window would give rise to a significant overlooking impact in this regard.

At loft level, the proposed two rooflights to the rear (western) elevation are considered to be positioned at a high level. As such, these are considered to serve light rather than offer a significant degree of outlook. Accordingly, these are not considered to overlook the nearby neighbouring property. Furthermore, there would be a new side (southern) elevation window added to the two-storey extension. It is considered that part of the view out from this window would be obscured by the existing single storey rear extension and the boundary fencing would obscure the remainder of the view.

Additionally, two new side (northern) elevation windows would face out across the road towards the nearby property at 63. These proposed windows would be limited in size and serve as secondary windows to a principal bedroom. Whilst there are side (southern) facing windows at 63, the separation distance of circa 15m coupled with the limited window size are considered to help overcome an overlooking impact.

In terms of overbearing, the proposed extension would be offset from the shared boundary to the south of the site with 59 and would not likely result in an overbearing impact. Furthermore, the extension would be set away from the nearby sites at 1 Turners Mill Close to the west and 63 to the north. As such, it is not considered that the proposed extension would result in a significant overbearing impact towards the nearby neighbouring dwellings.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered to comply with the provisions of DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan in terms of neighbouring amenities.

Biodiversity Net Gain

Biodiversity net gain is required under a statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This is a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. As a householder application this development is exempt from the requirement to provide biodiversity net gain.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is considered that the proposed two storey side extension would be of a significant size, scale and form which would fail to remain subservient towards the existing dwelling. Design features such as the gable end and rear projection would dominate the elevations to which they are sited along and views towards these elements would be increased by virtue of the site's corner plot location. The proposal would reduce the offset from the northern side boundary in two storey built form and increase the overall built presence to this side. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with the provisions of DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policies E9 and H9 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan, Principles DG49 and DG50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide, Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework and the National Design Guide.

Decision: Refusal

Case Officer: Stefan Galyas