

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/1281	Case Officer:	Catherine Cardin
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed single storey rear extension, conversion of garage, external material change including new porch		
Site:	4 Farlington Close, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 3EH, , ,		
Validation Date	22 May 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	28 Jul 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	6 Aug 2026
Target Date:	17 Jul 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Catherine Cardin</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:		Date:	
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/1281

**4 Farlington Close, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 3EH, , ,
Proposed single storey rear extension, conversion of garage, external material change including new porch
Mr David Ward**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

One letter of representation was received in support of the application. This letter considered the proposal to be a positive addition to the area.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

MSDC Heritage Officer

The application site is an unlisted detached house, part of a late 20th century development to the east of Oathall Road. It is directly adjacent to the boundary of The Heath Conservation Area, and would be considered to be within its setting. The house is not of any particular architectural merit and makes a neutral contribution to that setting, although the development along Farlington Close enjoys some consistency of architectural treatment and materials which contributes positively to the street scene.

The current proposal is for alterations and extensions to the house comprising a porch extension to the front of the building, conversion of the existing integral garage to form part of the house, with replacement of the garage door with a window, a rear extension, and replacement of hung tile at first floor to the façade with render.

I do not consider that the principle of these works is contentious in terms of impact on the setting of the Conservation Area, however I would note that the proposal for black windows, doors, fascia and soffit would be out of keeping with the street scene of Farlington Close, and should be amended to white. The change from uPVC to aluminium I would have no objection to, subject to this amendment. The proposal also includes removal of the existing tile hanging to the front elevation in favour of white render. In my opinion this is also regrettable in terms of the impact on the street scene, and would benefit from reconsideration, however I note the presence of similar render to the neighbouring property.

In summary the principle of the proposal is not considered contentious, but aspects of the detail would benefit from reconsideration to ensure that the street scene of Farlington Close and the setting of the Conservation Area are preserved.

MSDC Tree Officer

No objection.

Southern Water

No objection.

TOWN COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No comment.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for a single-storey rear extension, garage conversion and external alterations, including the construction of a new porch.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

No relevant history.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application property is a two-storey detached dwelling. The property is characterised by red brick, white uPVC fenestration and a plain tile roof. The property benefits from an area of off-street parking to accommodate approximately four cars and an attached garage.

The application property is located within the built-up area boundary of Haywards Heath and lies within the setting of The Heath Conservation Area. Neighbouring properties are located to the east, west and south. The public highway lies to the north.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposed rear extension would measure approximately 5.3 metres in width and 2.9 metres in depth. This would incorporate a flat roof with a maximum height of approximately 2.7 metres. A window door is proposed on the rear (southern) elevation and a further window on the side (western) elevation.

The proposal also seeks to extend the existing conservatory by installing a zinc cladding flat roof. This would measure approximately 5.5 metres in width and 4 metres in depth. This would incorporate black aluminium sliding doors on the rear (southern) and side (eastern) elevations, with a support column. This would have facing brickwork to match the existing dwelling.

It is also proposed to alter the existing porch by constructing a pitched roof. The pitched roof would have a maximum height of approximately 4.2 metres and an eaves height of 2.9 metres. This would incorporate a door on the front (northern) elevation.

The application also seeks permission to convert the existing garage. This would incorporate replacing the garage door with a window on the front (northern) elevation.

The proposal also seeks to add white render to the first-floor front (northern) elevation.

In addition, it is proposed to install four black aluminium windows on the front (northern) elevation, two windows and a door on the side (eastern) elevation, three windows and patio doors on the rear (southern) elevation and a further window on the side (western) elevation.

Finally, it is proposed to install a black fascia and soffit.

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
DP35 - Conservation Areas
DP37 - Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows

Site Allocations DPD

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

Relevant policies:
No relevant policies

Neighbourhood Plan

Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan was made in 2016.

Relevant policies:
E9 - Design
H9 - Extensions

Other Material Considerations

Mid Sussex District Plan 2021 - 2039 - Submission Draft (Regulation 19)

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 hearings were concluded on 19th March 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:
DPS2 - Sustainable Design and Construction
DPB1 - Character and Design
DPB3 - Conservation Areas
DPN4 - Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
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) (December 2024)

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 of the area and heritage assets
- Neighbouring amenities

- Parking arrangements
- Impact on trees
- Other matters
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Impact on character and appearance of the area and heritage assets

The application site lies immediately adjacent to The Heath Conservation Area and is therefore within its setting.

Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.

Policy DP35 of the District Plan in part states that:

'Development will also protect the setting of the conservation area and in particular views into and out of the area. New buildings of outstanding or innovative design may be acceptable in conservation areas provided that their impact would not cause material harm to the area.'

Policy DP26 of the District Plan relates to character and design and requires all proposals to be well designed and reflect the distinctive character of the towns and villages while being sensitive to the countryside as well as addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape. In part the policy requires proposals to be of a high-quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace; and creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape.

Policy E9 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan contains a similar ethos.

Policy H9 of the Neighbourhood Plan relates to extensions and requires 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.*

Paragraphs 212-215 of the NPPF state:

'212. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

213. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.

Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;*
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.*

214. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

*a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation;
and c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.*

215. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'

The Conservation Officer was consulted on the application and has provided comments.

The Heritage Officer raises no objection in principle to the proposed extensions and alterations, noting that the dwelling is an unlisted late 20th century house that makes a neutral contribution to the setting of The Heath Conservation Area. The proposed porch, garage conversion, rear extension and general alterations are not considered contentious in terms of their impact on the Conservation Area's setting.

However, the officer has raised concerns regarding certain design details. They consider that the proposed black windows, doors, fascias and soffits would be out of keeping with the established character of Farlington Close and have recommended that these elements be finished in white. Whilst they raise no objection to the use of aluminium rather than uPVC, this is subject to the colour amendment. They further consider that the replacement of the existing tile hanging with white render on the front elevation would be less sympathetic to the street scene, although it is acknowledged that similar render is present on the neighbouring property.

Whilst the Conservation Officer expressed some reservations regarding the replacement of the tile hanging, it is noted that rendered properties are present within Farlington Close, including the neighbouring dwelling. As such, render already forms part of the established palette of materials within the street scene. Given the presence of similar rendered finishes in the immediate vicinity, it is considered that the proposed rendering of the front elevation would not appear incongruous or introduce a harmful feature into the streetscape.

Whilst the Conservation Officer has also raised concerns regarding the proposed black windows, doors, fascias and soffits, it is noted that these elements would be applied to a modern dwelling of no particular architectural significance. Although the darker colour finish would contrast with the predominantly lighter palette of materials found within Farlington Close, the proposal would not alter the scale, form or architectural composition of the building. Given the neutral contribution the dwelling makes to the setting of the Conservation Area, and having regard to the varied detailing evident within the wider street scene, any resulting impact would be limited and would not result in harm to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. On this basis, the proposed colour treatment is not considered to warrant refusal of the application.

The proposed extensions are considered to be of an appropriate scale and design in relation to the existing property. The use of flat roofs responds appropriately to the architectural character of the existing building. Owing to their position to the rear, views of the extensions from the public realm would be limited and largely glimpsed, such that the development would have a minimal impact on the wider street scene and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Taking all of the above into account, it is considered that the proposed extensions and alterations, including the proposed render and fenestration changes, would not appear incongruous within the context of the surrounding development and would not materially affect the contribution that the site makes to the setting of The Heath Conservation Area. The development would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and preserve its setting. Accordingly, the proposal complies with Policies DP26 and DP35 of the District Plan and Policy E9 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood

Plan and satisfies the statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Neighbouring amenities

In terms of impact on neighbouring amenities, Policy DP26 of the District Plan states proposals 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'*.

To the east of the application property lies 5 Farlington Close. Given the single-storey nature of the extension, its modest depth and siting adjacent to the shared boundary, the proposal is not considered to result in significant harm to the light and outlook of this neighbouring property. Two doors and two windows are proposed on the side elevation (eastern) at ground floor level and one window at first floor level. Given the existing arrangement, it is not considered that the proposal would result in significant harm to the privacy of this neighbouring property.

To the south of the application property lies 23 Fairford Close. Given the single-storey nature of the extension and the separation distance of approximately 11 metres from the shared boundary, the proposal is not considered to result in significant harm to the light and outlook of this neighbouring property. Given that no new openings are proposed at first-floor level and the proposed rear-facing openings would serve habitable accommodation at ground floor level only, no significantly harmful impacts in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy are considered to arise.

To the west of the application property lies Corrin House. Given the single-storey nature of the extension and the separation distance of approximately 17 metres from these neighbouring properties, the proposal is not considered to result in significant harm to the light and outlook of these neighbours. A window is proposed on the side (western) elevation at ground floor level. Given the separation distances and the existing boundary treatments, it is not considered that the proposal would result in significant harm to the privacy of these neighbours.

Due to the domestic nature of the proposed development, it is considered that there would not be a harmful impact in terms of noise, air and light pollution.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy DP26 of the District Plan, and the relevant principles of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.

Parking arrangements

Policy DP21 of the District Plan states that to meet the objectives of the West Sussex Transport Plan 2011- 2026, decisions on development proposals will take account of whether: *The scheme provides adequate car parking for the proposed development taking into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the development and the availability and opportunities for public transport; and with the relevant Neighbourhood Plan where applicable;*

It is noted that the proposal would result in the loss of an attached garage and the loss of one bedroom. 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. The dwelling would become a four-bedroom property, and the West Sussex County Council Parking Standards Guidance (2020) requires that 3 parking spaces should be provided. Whilst the garage would be lost, the property would retain a frontage capable of accommodating approximately four cars, exceeding the standards. It is therefore considered that, in this instance, the proposal would be acceptable in terms of highways impact.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would not result in severe highway impacts.

Therefore, the proposal is deemed to comply with policy DP21 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and the WSCC Parking Standards Guidance.

Impact on trees

Policy DP37 of the District Plan states in part that the *'District Council will support the protection and enhancement of trees, woodland and hedgerows, and encourage new planting. In particular, ancient woodland and aged or veteran trees will be protected.'*

There is one tree within the proximity of the development. The MSDC Tree Officer was consulted on the application and has provided a response. No objection has been raised to the proposal provided that a condition is included to secure the submitted Arboricultural Report. This can be secured by condition. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with the relevant criteria of policy DP37 of the District Plan.

Other matters

Whilst supporting the proposal, the representation raised concerns regarding the timing of construction works. Construction activities are controlled through separate environmental legislation and the issue does not affect the acceptability of the proposed development in planning terms.

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 proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its design, scale and appearance and would not result in unacceptable impacts on neighbouring amenity, parking provision or the setting of The Heath Conservation Area. Having regard to the statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, it is considered that the development would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal therefore accords with Policies DP21, DP26, DP35 and DP37 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policies E9 and H9 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant provisions of the NPPF. Accordingly, the application is recommended for approval.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Catherine Cardin