

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/1753	Case Officer:	Peter Davies
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Demolition of existing rear conservatory and existing front porch, partial demolition of the existing side elevation, reconfiguration of the existing roof, erection of front and rear extensions including a new storm porch, together with associated internal and external alterations		
Site:	79 Turners Mill Road, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 1NH, , , ,		
Validation Date	21 Jul 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	14 Aug 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	14 Sep 2026
Target Date:	15 Sep 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Peter Davies</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Steven King</i>	Date:	14 Sep 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/1753

**79 Turners Mill Road, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 1NH, , ,
Demolition of existing rear conservatory and existing front porch, partial demolition of the
existing side elevation, reconfiguration of the existing roof, erection of front and rear extensions
including a new storm porch, together with associated internal and external alterations
Mr And Mrs Moffatt**

REPRESENTATION RECEIVED

None received.

TOWN COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No comment.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing conservatory and front porch, partial demolition of the converted garage, erection of front and rear extension with storm porch and associated alterations.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

No relevant history.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application property is a semi-detached bungalow located on the south west side of Turners Mill Road, within the built-up area boundary of Haywards Heath.

The application property has a hipped roof with front gable end protrusion. The dwelling is constructed from white render with interlocking roof tiles and white uPVC fenestration. The dwelling is set back from the highway with off street parking and soft landscaping to the front. The locality is characterised by bungalows of a similar scale and design on the southwest side of Turners Mill Road with two storey detached dwellings of a similar scale, form and design located on the northeast side. Many of the properties have benefited from extensions.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The application seeks planning permission the demolition of the existing conservatory and front porch, partial demolition of the converted garage, erection of front and rear extension with storm porch and associated alterations.

The existing converted garage is to be demolished and replaced with an extension that extends to the rear and front of the property. The extension would be set in from the southeast side boundary by 0.72 metres and would extend forward from the front of the garage by approximately 6.35 metres to square off the staggered frontage and have a maximum width of 5.25 metres at the widest part. The extension would have a pitched roof to create a second gable end front protrusion. The rear extension would have a full width of approximately 10.10 metres with varying depth. The northwestern part would have a width of 6.50 metres and a depth of 2.75 metres and the south eastern part to have a width and depth of approximately 3.60 metres and 1.30 metres. The extension would have a crown roof with an eaves height of approximately 2.75 metres and an overall height of approximately 3.95 metres.

The materials are to be white render to match the existing dwelling to the front with the rear extension to be cedar weather boarding, the roof will be concrete roof tiles to match and the dwelling will have uPVC fenestration.

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 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:

DP21 - Transport
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.

Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan (made December 2016)

Relevant policies:

E9 - Design
H9 - Building Extensions

Other Material Considerations

Mid Sussex District Plan 2021-2039 Consultation Draft

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 is currently at Examination with initial hearings held in February/March 2026. The Council is consulting on Main Modifications which are required to ensure the plan is legally compliant and sound. The District Plan remains at Examination until the Inspector has published his report, until that time 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:

DPB1 - Character and Design
DPT4 - Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure

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) (August 2026)

National Planning Policy Guidance

ASSESSMENT

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

- Character and Design
- Impact on neighbouring properties
- Impact on Parking Provision
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Character and Design

Policy DP26 of the District Plan relates to character and design. In addition, policies E9 and H9 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan have a similar ethos. However, these are considered to have very limited weight as they are materially inconsistent with the NPPF, and greater weight should be given to policy DP3 of the NPPF.

Policy DP3 of the NPPF sets out the key principles for well-designed places. This sets out in part that proposals should respond to their context, so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets.

Principle DG49 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide relates to general principles for extensions and requires that extensions should fit in with both the existing house and its surroundings, appearing as a subordinate addition rather than overwhelming or competing with the original building.

Principle DG50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide relates to front and side extensions and states that front extensions are more likely to be acceptable where the building line is staggered or where the dwelling is set back from the road. Side extensions should be subservient to the original dwelling and will be resisted where they have an adverse impact on the street scene.

Principle DG51 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide relates to rear extensions and requires that rear extensions can be more modern or innovative in design, particularly when they are hidden from public view, but they should still relate well to the existing house, respect neighbouring properties, and avoid appearing disconnected from the original building.

The proposed extensions to the dwelling are large in scale however of an acceptable design and form to the character of the dwelling and the area. The front part of the extension will be visible from the street scene, however the dwelling is set back from the highway, and the materials are in keeping with the existing dwelling. Therefore, the application is considered to comply with the above part of policy DP3 of the NPPF, policy DP26 of the District Plan and policies E9 and H9 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Impact on Neighbouring Properties

Policy DP26 in part seeks to ensure that new development does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings. Policy H9 of the Neighbourhood Plan states that proposals should safeguard adjoining neighbours amenity. It is

considered that these policies have very limited weight as they are considered to be materially inconsistent with the NPPF and greater weight should be given to policies L2 and P3 of the NPPF.

Policy L2 of the NPPF relates to making effective use of land. Part L2(1dii) requires proposals to have *'acceptable living standards for residents and neighbours in terms of access to daylight, sunlight, privacy and external amenity space.'*

Policy P3 of the NPPF relates to living conditions and pollution. Part 2(b) of this policy requires proposals *'Not give rise to, or contribute to, an unacceptable level of access to daylight and sunlight for neighbouring residents and occupiers, or unacceptable levels of air, noise, artificial light, water, soil or other forms of pollution on or beyond the site.'*

The proposed extensions would be 0.72 metres from the southeast side boundary with no. 77 Turners Mill Road. The neighbouring property has a flat roof extension up to the shared boundary at a raised height due to differing ground level, with the submitted planning statement saying this height is 0.82 metres higher. The proposed rear extension would be of the same depth as the neighbouring extension and would have openings facing into the application properties rear garden. The front extension would run alongside no. 77 driveway. The extension would be at a lower level with the pitched roof running parallel to the boundary and would therefore not result in unacceptable harm to neighbour amenity areas. The side boundary would have 1 no. raised window that would be 1.70 metres above the finished floor level which would face towards the neighbouring driveway, however due to the height this would not cause unacceptable harm to neighbour amenities. Additionally, the driveway of no. 77 is open and visible from the street scene.

The proposed front extension would have the existing front protrusion between it and neighbouring property no. 81 to the northwest and have a distance of approximately 6.5 metres. The rear extension would be approximately 1.40 metres from the shared boundary with no. 81 marked by close board fencing. The extension would be of the same depth but of an increased height, however the extension is of an acceptable height so as not cause unacceptable harm to neighbour amenities.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with the above-mentioned parts of policies L2 and P3 of the NPPF, policy DP26 of the District Plan and policy H9 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Impact on Parking Provision

Policy DP21 of the District Plan seeks development to provide adequate car parking taking into account accessibility of development, the type, mix and use, and the availability and opportunities for public transport. It is considered that this policy has very limited weight as it is considered to be materially inconsistent with the NPPF and consideration should be given to policies TR4 and TR6 of the NPPF.

Policy TR4 of the NPPF relates to street design, access and parking. Part TR4(1e) requires proposals to *'Provide a suitable number of parking spaces for a range of transport modes where appropriate, reflecting the location and nature of the development (including its connectivity), any locally-set standards in the development plan, and including adequate provision of spaces and infrastructure that allow for the charging of electric vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations.'*

Policy TR6 of the NPPF relates to assessing transport impacts. Policy TR6(4) states *'Development proposals should be refused if they would have a severe adverse impact on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion, including cumulative impacts), or an unacceptable impact on highway safety; taking into account any mitigation measures proposed as well as any wider network improvements, including measures to support sustainable patterns of movement. This applies both during the construction phase and following completion.'*

West Sussex County Council Parking Standards Guidance (2020) outlines the County Council's approach to parking at new developments to ensure that sufficient parking is provided to meet the needs of the development while maintaining highway network operations, protecting surrounding communities and pursuing opportunities to encourage use of sustainable modes of transport.

West Sussex County Council Parking Standards Guidance (2020) outlines that for a 3-bedroom dwelling in this location that 1.8 parking spaces should be provided. The property would maintain 1 space on the driveway. Whilst the proposal would result in less than the required parking by the parking guidance, there are parking restrictions along the road to prevent hazardous parking on the public highway. The property is sustainably located with bus stops within 100 metres of the property and train station within walking distance. It is therefore considered that, in this instance, the proposal would be acceptable in terms of parking provision.

As such the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of highway safety and parking provision. The proposal therefore complies with policies TR4 and TR6 of the NPPF and policy DP21 of the District Plan.

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, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of design, scale and form and would not cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring residents. Therefore, the application complies with policies DP3, L2, P3, TR4 and TR6 of the NPPF and the relevant development plan policies DP21 and DP26 of the District Plan and policies E9 and H9 of the Neighbourhood Plan, and is considered acceptable.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Peter Davies