

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 28 March 2025 11:09:22 UTC+01:00
To: "Rachel Richardson" <Rachel.Richardson@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: 24 Royal George Rd BH DM/24/2875

Hi Rachel

That being the case, I consider that the proposal is acceptable, but given the apparent lack of certainty regarding whether the existing dormers will be retained and repaired or rebuilt, I would recommend an appropriate condition.

The proposal is therefore considered to preserve the character and appearance of the building, the terrace of which it is part, and the wider Conservation Area. This meets the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

I would recommend the following conditions:

- Details of roofing and facing materials
- Detailed drawings, at an appropriate large scale, including elevations and sections and annotated to show materials and finishes, of the following:
 - - typical examples of new windows
 - - typical examples of new external doors
 - - the repaired or rebuilt dormer windows to front and rear
 - - the timber fascia at ground floor to the front and side elevations
- New rainwater goods if required to be of painted metal
- New rooflight if required to be flush fitting metal framed conservation style rooflight.

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>



From: Andy Swaisland <andy@hillsarchitecturaldesign.co.uk>

Sent: 28 March 2025 09:58

To: Rachel Richardson <Rachel.Richardson@midsussex.gov.uk>

Cc: ben@mtmanagementltd.co.uk; Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: 24 Royal George Rd BH DM/24/2875

Hi Rachel, Emily

The dormer windows on the revised drawings submitted on 5/3/25 are the same size dormers as the existing.

I am surprised by the concerns regarding the dormer windows. Please see below image of the existing dormer facing Royal George Road.

As you can see from below image the dormer on No. 24 has been poorly maintained, has damaged PVC cladding and dormer cheeks which are not equal. There is also no overhang on the eaves so I expect there will be water ingress.



If the dormers are found to be in poor repair and require works to ensure that they are weather tight, structurally sound they will need to be rebuilt. The window size will remain but the structure will likely change to fix the above mentioned issues.

I would also note that dormers style along the terrace row vary greatly in size, design and cladding.



I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards

Andy Swaisland

From: Rachel Richardson <Rachel.Richardson@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: Thursday, March 27, 2025 4:23 PM
To: Andy Swaisland <andy@hillsarchitecturaldesign.co.uk>
Cc: ben@mtmanagementltd.co.uk <ben@mtmanagementltd.co.uk>; Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: 24 Royal George Rd BH DM/24/2875

Dear Andy and Ben,

Please see Emily's comments below.

Please can you reply and copy me in.

Many thanks,

Rachel.

Rachel Richardson Bsc (Hons) DIP TP MRTPI
Senior Planning Officer
Development Management
www.midsussex.gov.uk
01444 477 224

Please note I work part-time (usually over Monday to Thursday) and from home Monday to Wednesday.

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 March 2025 15:40
To: Rachel Richardson <Rachel.Richardson@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: 24 Royal George Rd BH DM/24/2875

Hi Rachel

Further comments on the above planning application following the receipt of revised plans.

The proposal has been further amended in respect of the front and rear dormers, however these still appear different in their proportions to the existing and to the neighbouring windows. Can the applicant confirm if it is their intention to rebuild the dormers, and if so, are these differences intentional, or due to inaccuracies in the plans? We need some clarity on this - ideally written confirmation of the applicants intentions, and/or annotated amended plans to show the existing dormers retained or that they will be replaced like for like in terms of their dimensions.

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

From: Emily Wade
Sent: 05 March 2025 14:57
To: Rachel Richardson <Rachel.Richardson@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: 24 Royal George Rd BH DM/24/2875

Hi Rachel

Further comments on the above application following the receipt of revised plans.

The application has been amended to show the two storey side extension reduced to a single storey projecting bay. Although the removal of the shop front is still proposed, the bay does at least to an extent reference a similar form. On balance, and given the existing alterations to the shopfront, this is considered acceptable.

The proposed front and rear dormers have been amended to reduce their scale and introduce a gabled roof form. However, as was noted in my original comments, the existing dormers appear to be original in their form, which is replicated to the other properties along the terrace of which the application site is part. In this context the loss of the existing dormers will be unacceptable in principle. I would therefore recommend that the existing dormers are retained, or if necessary replaced in facsimile.

In summary although the treatment of the side elevation is now considered acceptable, the works at roof level require further revision.

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>



From: Emily Wade
Sent: 26 February 2025 14:45
To: Rachel Richardson <Rachel.Richardson@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: 24 Royal George Rd BH DM/24/2875

Hi Rachel

Comments on the above planning application. My apologies for the delay in getting these to you, which has been caused by pressure of other work.

The application site is a late 19th/early 20th century end of terrace building, located on the corner of Royal George Road and Fairfield Road in Burgess Hill, within the Fairfield Conservation Area. The building, which would appear to have been subject to alterations and the likely loss of original features, is likely to have originally been a corner shop, mirrored by a similar shop to the opposite end of the terrace, but is now a commercial premises with a maisonette over.

The existing building, although altered and with some negative features which detract from its appearance (such as the box fascia and uPVC windows), does also retain some features which tie it to the remainder of the originally consistent terrace, and to the bookended shop at its opposite end, including the shop frontage (albeit that the shop windows themselves appear to have been replaced) and gabled dormers at front and rear. On balance, it makes a neutral, or slight positive contribution to the character and appearance of the terrace and of the wider Conservation Area.

The current application is for alterations and extensions to create 3 flats within the building, retaining the commercial premises at ground floor. The proposed external alterations include replacement of the dormers to the front and rear roof slopes with large dormer extensions, and a two storey flat roofed extension to the east side elevation.

Firstly I would note that the description of development appears misleading as the proposal also includes a two storey extension to the east elevation.

The current proposal raises a number of concerns in relation to the proposed associated external alterations:

- The existing gabled dormer windows to front and rear are, as noted above, among the surviving original features of the building which tie it to the rest of the originally

consistent terrace, and contribute positively to the largely uniform roof scape of the terrace. Their loss is therefore considered unacceptable in principle. Furthermore, the proposed replacement box dormers are overscaled in both cases, although particularly in respect of the dormer to the rear, and unsympathetic in their form and detailed design. In this respect it is worth noting that the rear roof slope is open to view from Fairfield Road to the north. This will exacerbate the negative impact on the character and appearance of the building, the terrace and the wider Conservation Area, contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35. It is also contrary to the requirements of the Council's adopted design guide, in particular Design Principle DG52 (Loft Conversions and Roof Extensions) and Chapter 6 (6.3.5-6.3.8).

- The proposed flat roofed two storey side extension is also considered unacceptable. This elevation of the building faces onto the junction with Fairfield Road and is a prominent feature of the building. The proposed addition would result in the partial removal of what is presumed to be the original, although altered, shop frontage to the building, which wraps around the corner from Royal George Road onto Fairfield Road. In its location and form it appears an incongruous addition to the existing building and terrace. This would also be contrary to DP35, and to Design Principle DG50 (Front and Side Extensions).

In summary the proposal is considered contrary to DP35 and to the adopted Design Guide. In terms of the NPPF, it would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation Area, such that the balancing exercise set out in paragraph 215 will apply.

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>

The
Electoral
Commission



No ID? You can apply for free voter ID
Find out more at

electoralcommission.org.uk/voterID

or call 0800 328 0280

The information contained in this email may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Unless the information contained in this email is legally exempt from disclosure, we cannot guarantee that we will not provide the whole or part of this email to a third party making a request for information about the subject matter of this email. This email and any attachments may contain confidential information and is intended only to be seen and used by the named addressees. If you are not the named addressee, any use, disclosure, copying, alteration or forwarding of this email and its attachments is unauthorised. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately by email or by calling +44 (0) 1444 458 166 and remove this email and its attachments from your system. The views expressed within this email and any attachments are not necessarily the views or policies of Mid Sussex District Council. We have taken precautions to minimise the risk of transmitting software viruses, but we advise you to carry out your own virus checks before accessing this email and any attachments. Except where required by law, we shall not be responsible for any damage, loss or liability of any kind suffered in connection with this email and any attachments, or which may result from reliance on the contents of this email and any attachments.