

Delegated Decision
Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/1336	Case Officer:	Caroline Grist
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Demolition of existing rear conservatory and construction of new rear ground and first floor extension to form ground floor dining room and kitchen, and extension to first floor bedroom. External works to building surrounding area, new door to replace ground floor window on south elevation.		
Site:	More House, Copyhold Lane, Cuckfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5EB, ,		
Validation Date	22 May 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	18 Jun 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Refusal	Recommendation Date:	16 Jul 2025
Target Date:	17 Jul 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Caroline Grist</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	16 Jul 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/1336

**More House, Copyhold Lane, Cuckfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5EB,
Demolition of existing rear conservatory and construction of new rear ground and first floor
extension to form ground floor dining room and kitchen, and extension to first floor bedroom.
External works to building surrounding area, new door to replace ground floor window on south
elevation.
C/O Agent**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

No representations have been received in response to this application.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Southern Water

Southern Water has determined that the flow rate for the above site will remain consistent, so capacity is not an issue and no Southern Water assets will be affected. Therefore, Southern Water has no objections to this proposal.

Newt Officer

The proposed development is not considered to be relevant to the District Licensing Scheme in this case and we consider there would be no likely impact on great crested newts or their habitats. I therefore have no comments to make at this time. If the proposal changes, then please seek further advice from me if necessary.

Conservation Officer

The site, More House, is an unlisted building located to the west side of the junction between Tylers Green and Copyhold Lane outside Cuckfield village. The building is one of a pair with its neighbour, The Crossways. Both date from the first half of the 20th century, and are to a design by the noted local architect Harold Turner, in the Arts and Crafts style. Turner, who was prolific locally, also designed a number of houses on Courtmead Road within the nearby Cuckfield Conservation Area, as well as Franklands Village, now also a Conservation Area. The character appraisal for the Cuckfield Conservation Area contains the following commentary on the architect and his style:

'Turner took important vernacular elements within the design and accentuated and embellished them, such as chimneys and entry porches. He was greatly influenced in his house design by the Arts and Crafts movement of the late 19th century, which focussed on the beauty of natural materials and honest craftsmanship.

Turner used high quality materials with great attention to detail and worked with skilled craftsmen such as carpenters, stained glass makers and blacksmiths. Whilst there are characteristic elements in the design of the properties, each Turner house is unique with its own special features. The window design in a Turner property is one of his most distinctive features. The design used 1930's Crittall windows with very fine leaded panes, stained glass and metal window fastenings. The doors of a Turner House are always carefully designed using high quality wood and glass to form the key central feature of the property. Some have a cantilevered decorative overhang above the door to focus attention on the entrance and to protect the occupiers and visitors from the elements. Another distinctive feature is tall, decorative chimney stacks.'

More House can be seen as typical of Turner's work in its Arts and Crafts style, and for the inclusion of features such as a prominent central chimney above a hipped roof with catslide to the side, curved metal eaves brackets, oriel windows, including highly decorative leaded and stained glass, and a palette of materials including hung tile and brick. Its neighbour, The Crossways, is of a similar design, forming a handed pair.

Both buildings have been extended, More House by the addition of a conservatory to the rear, and The Crossways by a more substantial two storey side extension, planning permission for which was granted in 2008, and which refers stylistically to the original house.

In my opinion More House possesses architectural value based on its design, construction and craftsmanship, as well as historical illustrative value as a good example of an Arts and Crafts influenced house of the early 20th century associated with a noted local architect, and aesthetic value, based partly on the use of vernacular materials. It also has group value with its neighbour The Crossways. On this basis, I would consider there are good grounds for considering the pair of buildings to be non-designated heritage assets (NDHAs), of a mid level of historical and architectural interest within the local context.

The current proposal, which follows on from pre-application advice and from a refused application for a similar scheme, is for a part single, part two storey extension to the rear of the building.

The proposal raises a number of concerns in terms of the impact on the significance of More House as an NDHA:

- The existing conservatory is modern and not of any particular interest- its removal is not considered contentious.
- However, the scale of the replacement additions is in my opinion excessive, and results in an inappropriate relationship of scale between the original house and the extensions to it. This is notwithstanding the amendments that have been made to the relative width of the two elements of the rear extension in comparison with the refused scheme, in that the two storey element is narrower than previously shown, and the single storey wider, and to the roof form of the two storey element, which now has lower eaves with a hipped roof which is cranked at the base, rather than a flat roof with a parapet. Notwithstanding these changes the extensions, in particular the two storey element, which remains very deep, will be unduly visually prominent, in particular in glimpsed side views of the property from Copyhold Lane. This will be contrary to the Council's adopted Design Guide states at Design Principle DG49 that: 'Extensions should... normally be designed to be well-integrated with the existing scale, form and massing allowing the original building to remain the dominant element of the property whether it has one or several additions.'

In making these comments I remain mindful of the existing two storey side extension to The Crossways, however although substantial this addition is at least subservient in height to the host building, and of a sympathetic design. It was also granted planning permission outside the lifetime of the current District Plan, and before the adoption of the Design Guide. I do not therefore regard it as a wholly relevant precedent in terms of the current proposal.

- The form of the current proposal, in particular the narrow but deep two storey element, does not sit comfortably with the host building. The visual relationship between this element and the host building is in my opinion awkward and contrived, due to the unusual, elongated proportions of the extension, which do not relate well to the squarer form of the house.
- Whilst I understand the intention behind the revised (in comparison to the refused scheme) detailing to the two storey element, in terms of the hipped roof and use of leaded windows, is to relate the addition better to the original building, these features are not sufficient in the context of the above mentioned issues with scale and form to achieve a harmonious relationship between the two. In addition, the extensive expanses of unrelieved brickwork to both side elevations, and particularly that to the side facing the neighbouring property at The Crossways, and would detract both from the appearance of More House and the setting of its neighbour.

The application drawings also include replacement of the original Turner designed windows to the house with modern black metal framed units, which is considered highly regrettable, although the submitted DAS suggests that this work can be carried out under permitted development rights.

In summary, although the principle of a rear extension remains potentially acceptable, and the scheme has been revised since the previous refusal, the current proposal unfortunately remains unsympathetic to the host building in its scale, form and detailed design. In these respects it is contrary to both the adopted Design Guide as set out above, and District Plan Policy DP26 (Character and Design), which requires that 'All development and surrounding spaces, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings and replacement dwellings, will be well designed...' It is also contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34 (Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets), which states that 'The Council will seek to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the character and quality of life of the District.'

In terms of paragraph 216 of the NPPF, I would regard the proposal as resulting in a mid-high level of harm to an asset of a mid level of interest in the local context.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Committee resolved to take the lead from the planning officer and agreed with the comments made on the previous application in the Delegated Report. Committee also agreed that the proposed application failed to be in accord with Cuckfield Neighbourhood Plan's policies CNP1 a) is designed to a high quality which responds to the heritage and distinctive character and reflects the identity of the local context of Cuckfield as defined on Map 3 - Conservation Areas and Character Areas, by way of; i. height, scale, spacing, layout, orientation, design and materials of buildings, (...) and CNP10 a) The scale, height and form fit unobtrusively with the existing building and the character of the street scene.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought to demolish an existing rear conservatory and construct a part two storey, part single storey extension. New windows are also proposed and additional door to utility room on south elevation.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

CU/291/77 - To convert garage into dining room and build new garage. Permission.

CU/020/93 - Application for a Certificate of Lawfulness for a proposed conservatory. Permitted Development.

DM/24/2367 - Demolition of existing rear conservatory and construction of part two storey, part single storey extension. New windows, additional door to utility room on south elevation. Refused.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

More House is an east facing, two storey, detached dwelling that is situated on a corner plot. It is constructed of brick, with tile hanging at the first floor level, a plain tile roof and has crittall windows. The dwelling is characterised by a central chimney over a hipped roof, and has a catslide roof to the side.

The site is located outside the built up area of Cuckfield and is therefore within the countryside. Neighbouring dwellings are situated to the north and west, whilst Tylers Green is to the east and Copyhold Lane is to the south. The site is set back from the highway behind a gravel parking area and front garden. More House is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA).

APPLICATION DETAILS

This application forms a re-submission of the previously refused application DM/24/2367. Planning permission is again primarily sought to replace an existing conservatory with a ground floor and first floor

extension to the rear of the dwelling. On the ground floor a kitchen and dining area is to be created, whilst on the first floor a dressing room and en-suite are proposed.

The two storey element is to be some 5.7 metres deep and 3.2 metres wide. It is to have a pitched roof design, with solar panels on the southern roofslope. It is to measure approximately 4.9 metres to the eaves and 6.5 metres to the ridge. The single storey section is to be some 5.6 metres wide and 4.4 metres deep. It is to be of a flat roof design, which would be approximately 2.6 metres high.

In terms of materials, the two storey section is to be finished in brick and roof tiles, to match the existing dwelling. The single storey extension is to be predominantly glazed, with a green roof.

It is also proposed to replace the existing single glazed, Crittall windows with double glazed, heritage aluminium windows in a Crittall style. An additional door is to be installed, to the utility room, on the southern elevation.

The previous application was refused for the following reason:

'The proposed extension, by virtue of its scale, form and design, would result in a dominant and unsympathetic addition to the existing dwelling. This property is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset, of mid level interest in the local context and the harm identified is at the mid to high level. It would also appear unduly visually prominent, particularly in glimpsed side views of the property from Copyhold Lane, creating an incongruous and harmful addition to the streetscene. The proposal therefore fails to accord with policies DP26 and DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policies CNP1 and CNP10 of the Cuckfield Neighbourhood Plan, principles DG49 and DG51 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD and the relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework'.

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, the Cuckfield Neighbourhood Plan and Site Allocations Development Plan Document.

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:

DP12 - Protection and Enhancement of Countryside

DP26 - Character and Design

DP34 - Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets

Site Allocations Development Plan Document

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

There are no relevant policies.

Cuckfield Neighbourhood Plan

The Cuckfield Neighbourhood Plan was made on 1st October 2014.

Relevant policies:

CNP1 - Design of New Development and Conservation

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 (Regulation 19) is currently at Examination and the stage 1 hearings were concluded on the 31st October 2024. There are unresolved objections to some of the policies in the draft District Plan and as such, 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

DPS6 - Health and Wellbeing

DPC1 - Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside

DPB1 - Character and Design

DPB2 - Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets

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

Design and heritage impact

More House is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. Policy DP34 relates to both designated and non-designated heritage assets and states:

'Development that retains buildings which are not listed but are of architectural or historic merit, or which make a significant and positive contribution to the street scene will be permitted in preference to their demolition and redevelopment.'

The Council will seek to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the character and quality of life of the District. Significance can be defined as the special interest of a heritage asset, which may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic.

Proposals affecting such heritage assets will be considered in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and current Government guidance'.

Paragraph 216 of the NPPF states the following:

'The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset'.

The site is also located outside of a defined built up area boundary and, as such, is within the countryside. Policy DP12 of the Mid Sussex District Plan seeks to protect the countryside *'in recognition of its intrinsic character and beauty'* and supports new development *'provided it maintains or where possible enhances the quality of the rural and landscape character of the of the District'*.

In terms of design, policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states:

'All development and surrounding spaces, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings and replacement dwellings, will be well designed and reflect the distinctive character of the towns and villages while being sensitive to the countryside. All applicants will be required to demonstrate that development:

- o is of high quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace;*
- o contributes positively to, and clearly defines, public and private realms and should normally be designed with active building frontages facing streets and public open spaces to animate and provide natural surveillance;*
- o creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape;*
- o protects open spaces, trees and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;*
- o protects valued townscapes and the separate identity and character of towns and villages;*
- o does 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 (see Policy DP27);*
- o creates a pedestrian-friendly layout that is safe, well connected, legible and accessible;*
- o incorporates well integrated parking that does not dominate the street environment, particularly where high density housing is proposed;*
- o positively addresses sustainability considerations in the layout and the building design;*
- o take the opportunity to encourage community interaction by creating layouts with a strong neighbourhood focus/centre; larger (300+ unit) schemes will also normally be expected to incorporate a mixed use element;*
- o optimises the potential of the site to accommodate development'.*

The ethos of this policy is echoed in policy CNP1 of Cuckfield Neighbourhood Plan.

Cuckfield Neighbourhood Plan policy CNP10 states:

'Building extension will be permitted where it meets the following criteria:

- a) The scale, height and form fit unobtrusively with the existing building and the character of the street scene.*
- b) Spacing between buildings would respect the character of the street scene.*
- c) Gaps which provide views out of the village to surrounding countryside are maintained.*
- d) Materials are compatible with the materials of the existing building.*
- e) The traditional boundary treatment of an area is retained and, where feasible, reinforced and*
- f) The privacy, daylight, sunlight and outlook of adjoining residents are safeguarded'.*

The Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD also provides advice for extensions to dwellings. Principle DG49 states that:

' Extensions should respond to the design of the original dwelling and applicants will be expected to demonstrate how local character has informed the design proposal. Extensions should also normally be designed to be well-integrated with the existing scale, form and massing allowing the original building to remain the dominant element of the property whether it has one or several additions.

Extensions should typically use simple, uncomplicated building forms to complement 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.

Extensions should not result in a significant loss to the private amenity area of the dwelling.

There are two general approaches to extending a property:

- o Designing in the style of the existing building by closely matching its facing materials, architectural features, window sizes and proportions; and*
- o Designing in a contemporary style that takes its cues from key aspects of the existing building that might include its underlying form and proportions, facing materials, window design and other specific architectural features. The success of this approach is particularly reliant on high quality facing materials and finishes, and this will normally need to be demonstrated through detailed elevations and section drawings.*

Both approaches can create successful, well-designed extensions that can be mutually beneficial to both the house and the wider area'.

Principle DG51 relates to rear extensions and states:

'Rear extensions which are not visible from the street and do not negatively impact on neighbouring properties can be expressed in many forms, including by adopting a contemporary architectural approach. With reference to DG49, they should nevertheless have consideration for the character of the existing building and the relationship of the extension with the side boundaries and adjacent buildings and gardens'.

The application relates to More House, which is an unlisted building, located outside of Cuckfield village. It forms a pair with The Crossways, to the north of the site. Both dwellings date from the first half of the 20th century and are designed in the Arts and Crafts style by the local architect, Harold Turner. As set out in the Conservation Officer's comments, Turner was locally prolific and the application property is considered to be typical of his work. It, and its neighbour, also contain a number of distinctive features and form a handed pair. Whilst previously extended, the Conservation Officer has advised that More House possesses architectural value based on its design, construction and craftsmanship, as well as historical illustrative value as a good example of an Arts and Crafts influenced house of the early 20th century associated with a noted local architect, and aesthetic value, based partly on the use of vernacular materials. It also has group value with its neighbour The Crossways. As such it is concluded that there are good grounds for this pair of buildings to be considered NDHAs, of a mid level of historical and architectural interest within the local context.

Planning permission is sought to replace the existing conservatory, to the rear of the property, with a part two storey, part single storey extension as well as other works to the dwelling. The currently application differs from that previously considered firstly in terms of dimensions. The two storey addition has been reduced in width from some 4.0 metres to 3.2 metres, whilst the ground floor element has increased in width from some 5.1 metres to 5.6 metres. A pitched roof design is also now proposed for the two storey addition, rather than a flat roof, and changes have also been made to the window design of the two storey addition.

The Conservation Officer has also commented on the proposed development and has raised a number of concerns. This is firstly in terms of scale. The proposed extensions are advised as excessive and would result in an inappropriate relationship of scale between the original house and the extensions to it. The changes that have been made to the proposal are acknowledged, however the extensions, in particular the two storey addition, would remain very deep. As such the development would be unduly visually prominent, in particular in glimpsed side views of the property from Copyhold Lane. Consideration has been given to the two storey side extension at The Crossways, but this addition is not considered comparable with the proposal under consideration.

The other areas of concern relate to the form and detailed design of the addition. It is advised that the narrow, but deep, two storey section does not sit comfortably with the host dwelling. The resulting visual arrangement would appear awkward and contrived, due to the elongated proportions of the extension in comparison to the squarer form of the house. Furthermore, whilst the use of a hipped roof and changes to the fenestration are noted, they are not advised as being factors that would be sufficient to overcome

the issues relating to scale and form and achieve a harmonious relationship between the two. Lastly the extensive expanses of brick to both the side elevations, particularly the side facing The Crossways, are considered to detract from both the appearance of More House and the setting of its neighbour.

The concerns raised by the Conservation Officer are shared from a design perspective. The scale is considered to be of concern with the two storey section, in particular, having a depth comparable to that of the host dwelling. It is considered that the proposed extension would not allow the original building to remain the dominant element of the property and would visually compete with it. With regards to the proposed form of the extension, it is considered that the extensions do not successfully respond to the main house in terms of its underlying form and proportions. The expanse of brick that would arise on the two storey extension is also considered to appear unsympathetic.

With regards to the impact on the streetscene, glimpsed views of the extension could be obtained from Copyhold Lane and, given the aforementioned design issues, would create an incongruous feature particularly as only the two storey element would be visible in public views.

The NPPF sets out that where harm is identified to a NDHA, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. The Conservation Officer has judged the level of harm to be mid-high and the NDHA to be of mid level interest in the local context. Given the direct link between the property and Turner, the features of interest and the impact, discussed above, that the proposal would have, this conclusion is agreed with.

It is therefore considered that the proposed development would fail to comply with policies DP26 and DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policies CNP1 and CNP10 of the Cuckfield Neighbourhood Plan, principles DG49 and DG51 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide and the relevant provisions of the NPPF.

Impact to neighbouring amenity

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states:

'does 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 (see Policy DP29);'

The proposed extension would be positioned closest to The Crossways, to the north of the application site, with two storey section nearest to the shared boundary. Both dwellings are set back from the boundary line. The boundary comprises established, mature planting, which has grown to eaves height closest to the dwellings. The Crossways has patio doors and a first floor window in close proximity to the boundary.

In terms of the extension, whilst it is to be two storeys high it will be set away from the boundary by some 2.0 metres. Given the arrangement of these properties, the existing boundary treatment and the proposed set back, it is considered that whilst there would be some impact to The Crossways' light and outlook the harm would not be significant enough to warrant the refusal of this application. No windows are proposed that would result in any direct overlooking.

Given the domestic nature of the proposal, it would not have a significantly harmful impact in terms of noise, air or light pollution.

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 proposed extension, by virtue of its scale, form and design, would result in a dominant, unsympathetic and contrived addition to the existing dwelling. This property is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset of mid level interest in the local context and the harm identified is mid to high. It would also appear unduly visually prominent, particularly in glimpsed side views of the property from Copyhold Lane, creating a prominent and harmful addition to the streetscene. The proposal therefore fails to accord with policies DP26 and DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policies CNP1 and CNP10 of the Cuckfield Neighbourhood Plan, principles DG49 and DG51 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD and the relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Decision: Refusal

Case Officer: Caroline Grist