

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 February 2025 15:25:30 UTC+00:00
To: "Hamish Evans" <Hamish.Evans@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/24/2046 29 High Street, LF

Hi Hamish

Comments on the above planning application.

The application site is one half of a semidetached pair of 19th century houses located within the Lindfield Conservation Area. The pair are in a particularly prominent position facing over the area around the village pond towards the High Street, and feature in some of the most attractive views within the Conservation Area.

The handed pair retain a number of original features including canted bay windows with sashes, and paired front entrances under a bracketed cornice. The original 'T' shaped footprint of the pair also remains legible, with a main front range and shared perpendicular projecting rear range, both under gabled roofs; the rear elevation to no.29 also appears to retain original sashes at first floor. No. 29 has been extended at ground floor to the rear by a brick built lean-to and a glazed infill addition in the angle of the front and rear ranges.

In my opinion, no. 29 and its adjoining neighbour make a strong positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, with the front elevation of the building facing towards the pond and High Street being of particular significance.

The current proposal is for a number of alterations and extensions to the building including demolition of an existing single storey rear/ side extension and construction of a rear single storey extension, reconstruction of the existing chimney to match existing, an increase in the basement footprint and associated internal and external alterations- these works are largely as approved under a previous application DM/24/0265. The current proposal also includes a first floor infill extension at the rear, and external landscaping works.

Firstly, to consider the minor alteration proposed to the works already given permission:

- The current proposal includes a further window to the side of the replacement rear ground floor extension. This is not considered contentious in principle, subject to detail.
- A change to the facing material of the ground floor addition sitting under the first floor extension discussed below is also proposed. Given the comments below on the first floor extension this work is unlikely to prove necessary or desirable- it will be preferable to retain the single facing material around the entirety of a single storey addition, as approved.

In respect of the additional works now proposed:

- The proposed landscaping works to the rear garden are not considered contentious, subject to detail of the materials involved. The proposed gazebo will be visible in views from the direction of Denmans Lane, looking across the intervening car parking area, but would be largely concealed behind the existing boundary is considered acceptable in its visual impact, subject to details of its design and materials (i.e. annotated scaled elevational drawings), which could be requested by condition. A new fence is proposed along the southern boundary, inside the existing fence. Although this is not considered

contentious in principle I would suggest that this should be kept to the height of the existing fence rather than overtopping it as is currently proposed, and therefore appearing somewhat untidy or unsightly from the neighbouring property.

- The existing approved application as originally submitted also included other works which were removed on Officer advice, including a first floor rear addition which increased the width and height of the existing original rear range. This aspect of the proposal was considered unacceptable for the reasons set out in the following comments:

'...the principle of an extension at first floor to the side of the existing rear wing is likely to be considered contentious. The original and characteristic T shaped plan and symmetry of the villa pair remain legible to the rear at first floor, but would be lost under the current proposal.

I would also consider that this aspect of the proposal would be contentious in terms of its scale (putting aside issues of symmetry) and the balance between the original house and the additions to it. The addition as proposed would almost entirely conceal from view or result in the loss of the original rear elevation of the main range of the house. The height of the rear range would also be increased to match that of the main roof ridge, resulting in the loss of way in which the rear range steps down from and appears subordinate to the principle front range of the building.

In addition to the harm this would cause to the character and appearance of the house in terms of its contribution to the Lindfield Conservation Area, which will be contrary to District Plan Policy DP35, this will also be contrary to the requirements of the Council's adopted Design Guide, in particular Design Principles DG49 (General Principles for Extensions) and DG52 (Loft Conversions and Roof Extensions).'

The currently proposed first floor addition is scaled back in relation to the previous proposal, in that it is set back from the line of the original rear range, and set down in height. This does allow some appreciation of the form of the original range to be retained, but it continues to detract from the original and characteristic T shaped plan and symmetry of the upper floor of the villa pair, and continues to obscure or result in the loss of the majority of the original rear elevation of the main house. Also, in my opinion, notwithstanding the reduction in size of the proposed extension, its scale remains such that viewed in conjunction with the proposed replacement addition at ground floor, it would be contentious in terms of the balance between the original house and the extensions to it.

The impact of the proposal on the wider Conservation Area will be exacerbated by the visibility of the upper floor and roofscape of the villa pair in views looking from Denmans Lane across the public car parking areas to the rear of the Co-Op building.

For these reasons, this aspect of the proposal is in my opinion harmful to the character and appearance of the house, the villa pair of which it is part, and the wider Conservation Area. This will be contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35. In terms of the NPPF the harm caused would be less than substantial, at around the low-mid range of that scale, such that the balancing exercise set out in paragraph 215 will apply. It will also be contrary to the requirements of the Council's adopted Design Guide, specifically Design Principle DG49 (General Principles for Extensions).

I would therefore recommend that the first floor addition is removed from the scheme in favour of the approved single storey replacement extension.

Thanks,

Emily

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

Submit your planning application online.

<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk>

Emily Wade Ma MSc

Conservation Officer

Planning Services

Tel: +44 (0)1444 477385

emily.wade@midsussex.gov.uk <http://www.midsussex.gov.uk>



No ID? You can apply for free voter ID

Find out more at

electoralcommission.org.uk/voterID

or call 0800 328 0280