

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/2026	Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed two storey rear extension.		
Site:	60A Gower Road, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 4PN, , , ,		
Validation Date	19 Aug 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	11 Sep 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Refusal	Recommendation Date:	6 Oct 2026
Target Date:	14 Oct 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Stefan Galyas</i>

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	1
---	--	------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Steven King</i>	Date:	7 Oct 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/2026

**60A Gower Road, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 4PN, , ,
Proposed two storey rear extension.
Mr John Donohoe**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

There was one letter of representation received in response to the proposed development. The letter objected to the proposal on the basis that an overlooking impact and loss of privacy would be incurred towards neighbouring occupiers.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

None received.

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No comment.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for a two-storey rear extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

12/02836/FUL - Demolition of existing dilapidated property and replacement with new Chalet Bungalow. Refusal.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site comprises a back land plot in-between Gower Road and Haywards Road. The site is accessed in-between numbers 60 and 62 Gower Road. The existing bungalow is positioned to the eastern end of the plot.

To the north there is a hedge around 2m in height on the boundary, with the domestic garden of Lyndon, another infill dwelling beyond this. To the east are the semi detached properties on Gower Road, some of which are flats. To the west there is a hedge some 2m in height on the boundary and beyond this are the properties that front onto Haywards Road. To the south there is a hedge 2.6m on the boundary. Beyond this at a lower level are the bungalows on Selby Court.

The site is within the built up area of Haywards Heath as defined in the Mid Sussex District Plan (MSDP) and an area of Townscape Character.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposal would develop a two-storey rear (west) extension. The proposal would measure at approximately 8.6m in length, 3.9m wide, 4.2m high to the lower eaves and 5.5m high to the top of the crown roof. Proposed external materials would comprise matching brickwork walls, plain roof tiles and felt to the flat roof element of the crown roof and white uPVC windows and 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

DP29: Noise, Air and Light Pollution

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 E10 - Areas of Townscape Character

Policy H9 - Domestic 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 has consulted on Main Modifications which are required to ensure the plan is legally compliant and sound with further Hearings taking place in November 2026. 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:

DPS1 - Climate Change

DPS2 - Sustainable Design and Construction

DPN6 - Pollution

DPN7- Noise Impacts

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) (August 2026)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2026 is a material consideration. Policies DP3, L2 and P3.

ASSESSMENT

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

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

Impact on Character and Appearance

Policy DP26 of the District Plan relates to character and design. Policies E9 and H9 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan are considered to have a similar ethos. However, Policy DP26 of the District Plan and Policies E9 and H9 of the Neighbourhood Plan 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 in part states:

To create well-designed places, development proposals should also reflect relevant aspects of the following principles, as appropriate to the nature of the development and its location.

e. Built Form: use the pattern of buildings to define the arrangement of streets, squares and other spaces, promote compact forms of development to optimise the site's potential, distinguish between public and private areas, create focal points and, where appropriate, enhance views into and out of the scheme

g. Identity: create visually attractive, distinctive and characterful development to establish or maintain a strong sense of place and pride, including through the use of a coherent palette of materials, design features and planting'.

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.'

It is considered that whilst the existing dwelling is set down a gravelled access from Gower Road to the East, there are still glimpsed public views offered towards the property. It is considered that the existing dwelling is a modest bungalow with a limited footprint, scale and massing.

The proposal would develop a two-storey rear (west) elevation extension which would utilise a crown roof form. It is considered that views towards the proposed extension would be offered from Selby Court to the south with visibility increased during the winter months whilst foliage is sparse.

The extension is considered to sit at odds with the existing modest bungalow and would overwhelm the existing building. The proposal would not appear subservient to the existing with the eaves being set at a

significantly higher level. Furthermore, the proposed extension would awkwardly intersect the existing dwelling and would sit at a right angle to the existing bungalow in terms of form. The proposed crown roof would also appear incongruous within its setting and would fail to relate well towards the existing. The use of a tall chimney flue to the western elevation is also considered to be a visually unattractive design feature.

In light of the above, the proposed development is considered to appear incongruous and would overwhelm the existing modest bungalow. The proposed design features would fail to correspond to the existing and it is therefore considered that the proposed development would not accord with Policy DP3 of the NPPF, Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policies E9, E10 and H9 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan and Principle DG49 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenities

In assessing the potential impact of the proposed development works upon the neighbouring amenities consideration needs to be given to District Plan Policies DP26 and DP29 as well as Policy H9 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

However, Policies DP26 and DP29 of the District Plan and Policy H9 of the Neighbourhood Plan are considered to have very limited weight as they are 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'*.

There is a mature boundary hedge set to the south which is set between No.12 Selby Court and the application site. As considered under the previous refusal for a replacement dwelling on site (12/02836/FUL), the neighbouring dwellings along Selby Court are set at a lower finished floor level than the application dwelling.

The proposal would include a new Juliet balcony to the southern elevation at first floor level. The proposed balcony would be set approximately 10m away from the rear garden and 17m from the rear elevation of No.12. As found previously under the aforementioned refusal on site 12/02836/FUL, without a hedge in place, there would be a clear and significant overlooking impact towards the small rear gardens at Selby Court.

The existing hedge is therefore considered to be a key mitigation measure to prevent an unacceptable overlooking impact from being incurred. However, a planning condition requiring the hedge to be maintained at 2.8m would prove difficult to enforce. Therefore, the future condition and health of the hedge cannot be guaranteed and in the event that the vegetation was lost, it would take a substantial period of time to re-establish itself to a sufficient height to prevent an unacceptable overlooking impact. Although a fallback position of a 2m high closeboarded fence could be erected under permitted development rights, it is still considered that due to the topographical difference in land levels, that an unacceptable level of overlooking would still be incurred.

Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to give rise to an unacceptable overlooking and loss of privacy impact, particularly towards No.12 Selby Court. The proposal would fail to comply with the provisions of Policy L2 of the NPPF, Policy DP26 of the District Plan and Policy H9 of the Neighbourhood 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

The proposed development is considered to overwhelm the existing modest bungalow and awkwardly relate to its immediate setting. The proposal would lack subservience and the use of the crown roof form would appear incongruous when viewed with the existing. Furthermore, the addition of the Juliet balcony at first floor level to the southern elevation would result in an unacceptable overlooking impact towards the gardens at Selby Court, particularly No.12.

As such, the proposal would fail to comply with the provisions of policies DP3 and L2 of the NPPF, policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and Policies E9, E10 and H9 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan.

Decision: Refusal

Case Officer: Stefan Galyas