

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/1418	Case Officer:	Anna Tidey
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Demolition of existing shed and erection of a single-storey pitched roof annexe ancillary to the main dwelling.		
Site:	1 Preston Cottages, The Green, Slaugham, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 6AQ, ,		
Validation Date	8 Jun 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	10 Jul 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Refusal	Recommendation Date:	4 Aug 2026
Target Date:	3 Aug 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Anna Tidey

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	3
--	--	-------------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	5 Aug 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/1418

**1 Preston Cottages, The Green, Slaugham, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 6AQ,
Demolition of existing shed and erection of a single-storey pitched roof annexe ancillary to the
main dwelling.**

Mr And Mrs Page

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

Three representations received, which contain the following objections:

- Object to the scale, height and position of the proposed building.
- It is sited 3m from boundary of Kent House, a Grade II listed building.
- Will cause material harm to setting of heritage assets: Kent House and wider historic environment.
- Modern black exterior would intrude upon the historic setting.
- Fails to preserve or enhance the Conservation Area, overdevelopment due to substantial size.
- The current outbuilding is much smaller, less than half the size and lower in height, with natural timber walls and a tiled roof, much more inkeeping with its surroundings.
- Proposal is harsh solid black, modern massing along garden edge.
- Would be overbearing and oppressive.
- Scale is excessive on narrow plot, where a major extension has been added to the dwelling.
- Plot density figures provided/found typical of built up urban residential estate.
- Proposed building would have a direct line of sight into neighbours summerhouse 8m away, used as a home office.
- Direct overlooking into neighbours private garden/home, would cause an unacceptable loss of privacy.
- Would form a separate residential dwelling for family use, creating backland development, introducing noise, foot traffic, outdoor conversations and activity to affect neighbours peaceful enjoyment of amenity space and historic environment.
- Light pollution concerns, affecting darkness of rear gardens.
- Concerns regarding future letting out.
- The building is substantial not modest.
- The submitted photographs are misleading.
- No boundary treatments (fences/planting) are provided in the Design and Access Statement.
- The building is many times larger than the building it would replace.
- The building, in addition to the extension to the house, is significantly disproportionate to the original house footprint.
- Slaugham village is in a Conservation Area and the AONB, which protect history, ensure that new development will enhance/fit in and protect nature.
- The changes already made to Nos 1 and 2 Preston Cottages are incompatible with these objectives, and is impacting upon original smaller neighbouring properties.
- Object to the height of the pitched roof and proposed design/materials of the proposed development (black cladding),
- impact on the neighbouring properties, their outlook, and the green space and aspects.
- understand the desire for increased space, however this proposal is at odds with the nature of a conservation area, impacting negatively on surrounding homes and owners.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Conservation Officer: The application site is one half of a semi-detached pair of late C19th/early C20th cottages located within the Slaugham Conservation Area. The pair are flanked to either side by Grade II listed buildings: Kent House to the north, and 1 and 3 Bosworth Cottages to the south. These buildings are aligned along the eastern side of the street, with rear gardens backing onto open countryside.

I consider the proposal to be harmful to the character and appearance of the Slaugham Conservation Area and, through impact on setting, to the special interests of the above-mentioned listed buildings. This will be contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policies DP34 and DP35. In terms of the NPPF, I would place the harm caused as less than substantial, at the low-mid range of that scale in both cases.

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Slaugham Parish Council: Object. This proposal is not in keeping with its location within the Slaugham Village Conservation area. Whilst the applicants building is not listed, its immediate neighbour is Grade II listed and this proposal will cause harm to its setting. The building proposed is oversize and overbearing and dominant.

INTRODUCTION

This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of existing timber shed in the rear garden and the erection of a single-storey pitched roof annexe building to be used ancillary to the main dwelling at No 1 Preston Cottages, The Green, Slaugham.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

14/01474/FUL. Rear two storey extension, demolition of existing porch and creation of new. Approved June 2014.

09/03709/FUL. Rear extension to enlarge and open up kitchen with pitched tiled roof. Size reduced to reflect ancient covenant rights of way. Approved January 2010.

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

No 1 Preston Cottages is one of a pair of cottages sited on the eastern side of The Green, which serves as a highway to access a number of the neighbouring residential properties to the north of St Marys Church, forming the village centre. The property has been extended to the side and at the rear with a large two storey extension and accommodates four bedrooms. It. At the rear of the house there are external stepped decked areas, which lead down to the lower rear garden space. This backs onto an open field at the rear, where there is a further decked area.

The site for the proposed annexe building is on a level section of the garden, which currently accommodates a wooden shed with a tiled pitched roofline.

The Green provides a route from public paths leading to the south of the church, through the central part of the village and beyond, linking onto a public footpath (Route SLA/7S/2), which extends into the open countryside to the north of The Green.

The property is located in the High Weald National Landscape/AONB, within the Slaugham Conservation Area (established June 1984).

APPLICATION DETAILS

This application seeks planning permission to demolish an existing rear garden shed (which measures 4.37m wide by 2.8m deep and 2.7m high to the ridge) and to construct in its place, over an enlarged footprint, an annexe building (measuring 8m wide by 3.3m deep by 3.5m high to the ridge, off eaves set at 2.43m in height).

The proposed building would have a rectangular footprint and 30 degree pitched roof. The walls are shown to be finished with black vertical timber cladding under a steel sheet roof. The front elevation would have two pairs of 1.5m wide French doors, a 1.7m wide oriel window is shown in the east side elevation, a 1m wide window in the west side elevation and a 0.5m wide window is centrally located in the rear (south) elevation of the building. All of the doors and windows are shown to have black uPVC frames.

The proposed floor plan for the building indicates that within the building a bedroom and lounge space would be provided, with a central shower room and toilet.

The submitted Block Plan indicates that the proposed building will be positioned in part over the footprint of the current shed, located 0.6m from the southern garden boundary fence, which is shared with No 2 Preston Cottages, and approx. 3.1m from the northern garden boundary, which is shared with Kent House to the north.

The application was accompanied by a Personal Statement which confirms:

'The proposed annexe is intended to provide accommodation for our daughter so she can continue living close to the family while maintaining a degree of independence. As a family, we feel it is important to remain close and support one another in day-to-day life. We also regularly have family members and relatives staying with us throughout the year, and the additional space would help us accommodate family visits more comfortably.'

During the determination of the application a Clarification Letter has also been submitted to clarify matters that have been raised by the consultation process. The document contains the following points (in summary):

- *'The proposed annexe is not situated within the curtilage of Kent House and does not physically affect the listed building or its historic fabric.'*
- *The proposed annexe would be positioned approximately 3 metres from the shared boundary with Kent House and considerably further from the listed building itself, with intervening fencing, landscaping and incidental structures further limiting any appreciable visual relationship between the proposed development and the heritage asset.*
- *the annexe has deliberately been positioned adjacent to the southern site boundary and offset away from the northern boundary shared with Kent House. The siting therefore maximises separation from the neighbouring listed building and further reduces its visual relationship with the heritage asset and its garden setting.*
- *The design adopts a simple pitched roof form and restrained material palette inspired by traditional rural outbuildings commonly found within Sussex villages and countryside settings. The use of dark vertical timber cladding further reduces the building's visual prominence, allowing it to sit recessively within its landscaped surroundings.*
- *The proposed building is larger than the structure it replaces, the site comprises a generous and elongated residential plot which comfortably accommodates the proposal whilst retaining substantial areas of private garden surrounding both the host dwelling and the annexe.*
- *The annexe occupies only a relatively small proportion of the overall residential curtilage and remains clearly subordinate to the main dwellinghouse.*
- *the proposal remains single storey and has been intentionally designed as an ancillary garden building rather than a visually dominant standalone structure.*
- *The proposal does not include any first-floor accommodation, balconies, roof terraces or elevated external areas. The opportunities for overlooking are therefore inherently limited.*
- *The proposal is intended for ancillary family accommodation and not as a separate independent dwelling.*
- *No fixed external lighting forms part of this application. Should the Local Planning Authority consider it necessary, the applicant would have no objection to a condition requiring the submission and approval of an external lighting scheme.*
- *Representations regarding possible future occupation by unrelated parties are speculative and do not relate to the development currently proposed.*
- *No kitchen facilities are proposed and the accommodation remains limited in scale. The annexe would continue to rely upon the facilities and functional relationship of the main dwellinghouse and has not been designed to function as a self-contained independent residential unit.*
- *The overall scale, siting and internal arrangement of the building have intentionally been kept modest to ensure that the structure remains clearly ancillary in nature and does not function as a separate independent dwelling.'*

An amended site plan has been submitted during the course of determining the application to clarify that a former tree growing on the boundary at the end of the garden has recently been felled.

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.

Specifically Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states:

'In dealing with such an application the authority shall have regard to:

- a) The provisions of the development plan, so far as material to application,*
- b) And local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and*
- c) Any other material considerations.'*

Section 38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides:

'If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purposes of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.'

The requirement to determine applications "in accordance with the plan" does not mean applications must comply with each and every policy, but is to be approached on the basis of the plan taken as a whole. This reflects the fact, acknowledged by the Courts, that development plans can have broad statements of policy, many of which may be mutually irreconcilable so that in a particular case one must give way to another.

Under section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 if a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan, the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approved or published.

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 Slaugham 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:

- DP12 Protection and Enhancement of Countryside
- DP16 High Weald AONB
- DP26 Character and design
- DP34 Listed Buildings and other Heritage Assets
- DP35 Conservation Areas
- DP38 Biodiversity

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

Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan, made on 25th September 2019.

Policy 1 Protecting the AONB

Policy 4 Conservation Areas

Other Legislation

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

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
DPN1 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery
DPS6 Health and Wellbeing
DPC1 Protection and Enhancement of Countryside
DPC4 High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
DPB1 Character and Design
DPB2 Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets
DPB3 Conservation Areas

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.

The High Weald Housing Design Guide 2020

High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan 2024-2029

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:

- Design and impact upon setting of Listed Buildings
- Impact upon the Conservation Area
- Impact upon the High Weald National Landscape (AONB)
- Impact on residential amenities
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Design and impact upon setting of Listed Buildings

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 as well as addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape.

The Council's adopted Design Guide is a material consideration in the determination of the application. Chapter 9 of the Design Guide relates to household extensions. Design Principle DG49 states that extensions should respond to the design of the original dwelling and applicant will be expected to demonstrate how local character has informed the design proposal.

There are a number of Listed Buildings sited within the centre of Slaughtam, the nearest of which are Kent House (Grade II Listed) and Nos 1 and 3 Bosworths Cottages. No 1 Preston Cottages therefore lies within the setting of these historic Listed Buildings, and this is a consideration when determining the current application.

The Council, as the Local Planning Authority, has a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving heritage assets. Listed Buildings and their settings are afforded special protection under the planning regime by virtue of Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (PLBCAA); paragraphs 201-215 of the NPPF and Policy DP34 of the District Plan.

District Plan Policy DP34 is relevant in the determination of this application. It states in part:

'Development will be required to protect listed buildings and their settings. This will be achieved by ensuring that:

- A thorough understanding of the significance of the listed building and its setting has been demonstrated. This will be proportionate to the importance of the building and potential impact of the proposal;*
- Alterations or extensions to a listed building respect its historic form, scale, setting, significance and fabric. Proposals for the conversion or change of use of a listed building retain its significance and character whilst ensuring that the building remains in a viable use;*
- Traditional building materials and construction techniques are normally used. The installation of uPVC windows and doors will not be acceptable;*
- Satellite antennae, solar panels or other renewable energy installations are not sited in a prominent location, and where possible within the curtilage rather than on the building itself;*
- Special regard is given to protecting the setting of a listed building;*
- Where the historic fabric of a building may be affected by alterations or other proposals, the applicant is expected to fund the recording or exploratory opening up of historic fabric.'*

The existing timber shed is of a modest scale for a garden outbuilding. It has a weathered appearance and a tiled roof, the 2.7m high ridge of which is set at 90 degrees to the close board boundary fence with No 2 Preston Cottages. The existing shed ridge height extends approx. 0.9m above the height of the boundary fence.

The 2.43 metre eaves height of the proposed shed would extend 0.63m above the 1.8m high boundary fence, and 3.5m ridge height would extend 1.7m higher than the boundary fence. It is considered that the additional roof height, relative to that of the existing shed, would make the proposed building visually more prominent, along with its overall dimensions being of a significantly larger scale in a narrow rear garden space.

The external black walls and steel roofing materials are contemporary in nature and the black palette would make the new building more visually dominant in the rear garden space, as it would contrast with the existing colours of the adjacent fences, established nearby outbuildings and the construction materials of the neighbouring older dwellings.

Comments have been provided by the Conservation Officer and these are reproduced above. She has raised concerns with the scale of the proposed new building within the context of the rear garden, which she considers excessive, and has raised concerns regarding the proposed materials. The use of black

sheet metal roofing and uPVC windows and doors is considered inappropriate to the historic context, which is generally characterised by traditional, vernacular materials.

The Conservation Officer is of the opinion that whilst the existing shed is not of any particular interest, and its replacement is unlikely to be considered contentious in principle, the scale of the proposed new building is excessive within the context of the rear garden, particularly when viewed cumulatively with the very substantial rear two storey rear and side addition to the house. The Conservation Officer considers that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the adjacent listed buildings.

The Planning Officer agrees with this assessment and as such the application is considered to be contrary to policies DP26 and DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and the Council's design guide.

This application needs to be considered with reference to guidance contained in Paragraphs 207-215 of the NPPF and with regard to the statutory duty of the Council, as the Local Planning Authority, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the character or appearance of the Slaughtam Conservation Area, as set out in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

NPPF is a material consideration in this situation as such this and paragraphs 207 to 215 are reproduced below:

'207. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

208. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

209. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.

210. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of: a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

211. In considering any applications to remove or alter a historic statue, plaque, memorial or monument (whether listed or not), local planning authorities should have regard to the importance of their retention in situ and, where appropriate, of explaining their historic and social context rather than removal.

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 level of harm identified to the setting of the adjacent listed buildings is considered to be 'less than substantial' in the context of para 215 of the NPPF, and in such instances the harm needs to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. There are no identified public benefits in this case that would outweigh the harm identified.

Having regard to the above, there are no material considerations that would outweigh the harm identified to the setting of the adjacent listed buildings.

Impact upon the Conservation Area

No 1 Preston Cottage is located within the Slaugham Conservation Area, which was established in June 1984.

This application needs to be considered with reference to guidance contained in Paragraphs 207-221 of the NPPF and with regard to the statutory duty of the Council, as the Local Planning Authority, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the character or appearance of the Slaugham Conservation Area, as set out in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. NPPF paragraphs 207 to 215 (set above) are relevant.

The District Plan contains Policy DP35, which requires development to conserve or enhance the special character and appearance of Conservation Areas. The Policy states:

'Development in a conservation area will be required to conserve or enhance its special character, appearance and the range of activities which contribute to it. This will be achieved by ensuring that:

- o New buildings and extensions are sensitively designed to reflect the special characteristics of the area in terms of their scale, density, design and through the use of complementary materials;*
- o Open spaces, gardens, landscaping and boundary features that contribute to the special character of the area are protected. Any new landscaping or boundary features are designed to reflect that character;*
- o Traditional shop fronts that are a key feature of the conservation area are protected. Any alterations to shopfronts in a conservation area will only be permitted where they do not result in the loss of a traditional shopfront and the new design is sympathetic to the character of the existing building and street scene in which it is located;*
- o Existing buildings that contribute to the character of the conservation area are protected. Where demolition is permitted, the replacement buildings are of a design that reflects the special characteristics of the area;*
- o Activities such as markets, crafts or other activities which contribute to the special character and appearance of the conservation area are supported;*
- o New pavements, roads and other surfaces reflect the materials and scale of the existing streets and surfaces in the conservation area.'*

Policy 4 in the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan supports development proposals in Slaugham where they conserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area concerned, and comply with the requirements in District Plan Policy DP35.

The Conservation Officer considers that the rear garden of No 1 Preston Cottages is one of a run of similar spaces on the eastern side of The Green which provide a verdant transition between the buildings within the Conservation Area and the countryside to the east, and which make a strong positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Area.

These comments are noted, but it is considered that the rear garden spaces at No 1, and to either side, are screened in public views from The Green by the presence of the dwellings fronting that public highway. As such there are no public views of the rear garden of No 1 Preston Cottages. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would have a neutral effect in terms of public impact upon the Conservation Area.

As a result of the position of the development to the rear of No 1 Preston Cottages the public experience of the special character of the Slaugham Conservation Area would not be adversely affected. It is therefore considered that the impact of the proposed annexe would not be contrary to the aims of District Plan Policy DP35, Policy 4 of the Neighbourhood Plan and the aims of the NPPF with regards to preserving heritage assets.

Impact upon the High Weald National Landscape/ AONB

The application site lies in the village of Slaugham which has no built up area, being within open countryside and within the High Weald National Landscape/AONB.

District Plan Policy DP16 is relevant. This states that development within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) will only be permitted where it conserves or enhances natural beauty and has regard to the High Weald AONB Management Plan. Small scale proposals which support the economy and social well-being of the AONB that are compatible with the conservation and enhancement of natural beauty will be supported.

The Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan contains Policy 1, which similarly seeks to Protect the AONB. It has similar aims to District Plan Policy DP16. Under section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 if a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan, the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approved or published. Whilst there is no conflict between Policy DP16 of the District Plan, Policy 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan is the more recent and is considered to take precedence.

The legal framework for AONBs in England and Wales is provided by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (CROW) 2000 which at Section 82 reaffirms the primary purpose of AONBs: to conserve and enhance natural beauty. Section 84 of the CROW requires Local Planning Authorities to 'take all such action as appears to them expedient for accomplishment of the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB'.

A similar ethos is found within The High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan which is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications in the AONB.

NPPF paragraph 190 is also relevant. It states: *'When considering applications for development within National Parks, the Broads and National Landscapes, permission should be refused for major development other than in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated that the development is in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:*

-the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;

-the cost of, and scope for, developing outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and

-any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated'.

The proposed addition of the proposed annexe would impinge on local views and the rural setting of Slaugham, but would not adversely affect the wider character of the National Landscape/AONB. Consequently, it is considered that this application accords with overall aims of Policy DP16 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policy 1 of the Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant NPPF and AONB guidance.

Impact on residential amenities

Policy DP26 of the District Plan requires developments to demonstrate that it does not cause significant harm to amenities of existing nearby residents (or future occupiers), taking into account matters such as impact on light, privacy and outlook.

In addition Principle DG45 in the Design Guide refers to the need to consider privacy of existing and future residents and it is noted that privacy may be affected by the relationship of buildings to each other.

The immediate neighbouring properties are Kent House, to the north of the site, and No 2 Preston Cottage, the attached neighbouring house, which both have overlooking windows. Both of the neighbouring houses benefit from long rear gardens, which extend to the field at the rear. Kent House has a 5.5m wide x 3.05m deep x 2.49m high garden room/summer house with a mono pitched roof in the rear garden (permitted under planning application 11/03255/FUL) which is understood is used for a home office. The principle of a separate outbuilding has been accepted by that approval.

The proposed annexe would be positioned into the garden, forward of the rear wall of the existing shed, and would extend to a significantly larger footprint than that of the existing shed in the narrow rear garden at No 1 Preston Cottage, the dimensions of which are as detailed above.

The use of a separate outbuilding for ancillary accommodation to that provided in the cottage could be accepted in this domestic garden setting. However it is considered that the size, height, form and scale of the proposed annexe building could impinge upon the enjoyment of the adjacent garden spaces, contrary to the aims of District Plan Policy DP26 and the Design Guide principles with regards to neighbouring amenities.

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 annexe, as a result of its scale, positioning, colour and external materials would have a detrimental impact on the setting upon the setting of neighbouring Listed Buildings, resulting in a low-mid level of less than substantial harm to these historic assets. There are no public benefits that would outweigh this harm.

It is considered that the application is contrary to policies DP26 and DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and the relevant parts of the NPPF with regards to preserving heritage assets and cannot be supported.

Decision: Refusal

Case Officer: Anna Tidey

