

Dear Mr Stuart,

DM/24/2946 – North Heath, Carmelstead Close, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 3AT.

Many thanks for your enquiry received the 3rd of December.

The original permission on site (00/02502/FUL) appears to have removed permitted development rights with condition 10 reading as follows:

“Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 or as amended in the future, no enlargement, improvement or other alteration of the dwellinghouse, whether or not consisting of an addition or alteration to its roof, nor any other alteration to its roof, shall be carried out, (nor shall any building or enclosure, swimming or other pool be provided within the curtilage of the dwellinghouse) without the specific grant of planning permission by the Local Authority.

Reason: To prevent the overdevelopment of the site or detriment to neighbours.”

Character and Appearance

The proposed extension is considered to be of a subservient appearance to the main dwelling and the use of matching materials to help assimilate to the existing is encouraged in this instance.

Whilst the parapet roof is not a roof pitch previously used throughout the existing dwelling, it is not considered that the roof would appear overly incongruous in this instance.

It is noted that some floor plans have been submitted illustrating a single storey garden room. The applicant's attention should be brought to keeping the height of the outbuilding to a limited scale. Furthermore, the existing garden amenity space should retain a decent amount in respect to the existing, usually as a rule of thumb this is over

50%. At present, it does not appear that the scheme would be in contravention of this guidance.

Amenity

There would be no side elevation windows to either side of the rear extension proposed which would face out towards neighbouring sites. As for the proposed outbuilding, it is not clear how high the proposal would be, however, it is encouraged that the overall size and scale is not significant. An offset from the shared boundary should be maintained to negate an overbearing impact towards adjacent neighbouring occupiers.

Woodland and Trees

Mid Sussex District Council's Trees Officer:

"Further to the meeting this morning, a quick summary of the tree related issues and requirements.

The trees adjacent to the proposal are covered by an area TPO, in addition to the Ancient Woodland (AW). The existing property has been constructed within the 15m buffer zone of the AW and any further development within or adjacent to the AW would be a matter for ecology. As discussed, Preliminary Ecology Survey (PEA) will establish the ecological requirements and any further surveys and monitoring that may be required.

With regards to the trees, there are several TPO trees that I can see from our records have had previous applications submitted and approved for work to be carried out to them. However, what I am unaware of is what trees may be affected by the proposal and how any trees would be protected at all stages of construction, as well as ensuring that the development would not have a detrimental effect on those trees.

Should a full application be made, I would require an Arboricultural Impact Assessment, which should include an Arboricultural Method Statement, Arboricultural Constraints Plan and Tree Protection Plan. This would help me to understand and ensure that trees are unharmed and can continue to thrive after the proposal has been implemented.

I would note that the garden room is currently proposed to be constructed within the Root Protection Area (RPA) of at least one TPO tree. It would be preferable if this could be located outside of the RPA of the protected trees and outside of the buffer zone of the AW.”

It is encouraged that the proposed outbuilding is sited away from the ancient woodland immediately to the north in order to minimise its impact.

Other Matters

Should the application be submitted under a householder application type, the proposal would be subject to a Biodiversity Net Gain ‘householder exemption’. Accordingly, further information would not be required in this regard to support the application.

I hope that this information is of assistance.

The above represents my informal view only based on the information contained in your enquiry. It does not prejudice the council from making whatever decision it considers appropriate on any application subsequently submitted.

The information contained in pre-planning advice may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Unless the information contained is legally exempt from disclosure, we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this advice to a third party making a request for information about the subject matter.