

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/1049	Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed first floor side extension, roof extension and alterations		
Site:	Esmeralda Cottage, 43 West Common, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2AJ, ,		
Validation Date	19 May 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	7 Aug 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	10 Aug 2026
Target Date:	14 Jul 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Stefan Galyas</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	12 Aug 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/1049

**Esmeralda Cottage, 43 West Common, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2AJ,
Proposed first floor side extension, roof extension and alterations
Mr Andrew Darby**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

There were no letters of representation received in response to the proposed development.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Conservation Officer: *'In my opinion, although the current proposal is in some respects an improvement over the refused scheme, in that the central chimney stack is retained and the box dormer to the rear omitted, it continues to raise concerns in terms of the impact on the significance of the NDHA and its group value with its neighbours. This is because the side extension at first floor and roof level is retained to the same scale and form. As with the previous, refused scheme, the proposed side extension will largely remove the existing, characteristic side catslide, and will entirely remove the original dormer window. As well as the direct harm this causes to the character of the property by adverse impact on original features, including the roof form, and the addition of undue bulk at high level to the side of the house, it also impacts significantly on the original, designed symmetry of this property with its neighbour Linden. This aspect of the proposal is in my opinion unacceptable for these reasons.*

For these reasons, the proposal is in my opinion harmful to the significance of Esmeralda Cottage as an NDHA. In terms of paragraph 216 of the NPPF, I would place the level of harm caused as mid level to an NDHA of a mid level of interest within the local context.'

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Parish Council: *'Lindfield Parish Council supports the Conservation Officers position.'*

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for the development of a first floor side extension, a roof extension and associated alterations.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/16/4957 - Proposed two storey side extension and 2 x single storey rear extensions (Amended description and plans dated 9 March 2017). Permission 14.03.2017.

DM/17/3475 - Non-Material Amendment to application DM/16/4957 - Minor amendment to ground floor rear walls to increase width of walls by circa 200mm towards central courtyard (away from neighbours). Permission 30.08.2017.

DM/17/3629 - Proposed single bay oak framed garage with side aisle incorporating a low roof height design. Refusal 06.11.2017.

DM/18/1841 - Proposed two storey side extension and 2x single storey rear extension. Permission 22.06.2018.

DM/18/1693 - Non Material Amendment to application DM/16/4957 - Reduction of the roof form from flat to hip. Various rooflights added. Refusal 09.05.2018.

DM/18/3841 - Proposed single garage with side store. An ECO design incorporating a Sedum roof and Larch clad sides with room for an electric charging point. Withdrawn 31.01.2019.

DM/25/2139 - Proposed first floor side extension and roof alterations, rear facing dormer window, front facing roof light window and removal of chimney. Refusal 25.11.2025.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application relates to Esmerelda Cottage, a two storey detached dwelling set to the north-western side of the highway. The existing dwelling is set back from the highway edge by a front gravel paved driveway with mature boundary planting and hedgerows abutting the highway edge to the front of the site. There is existing garden amenity space set to the rear of the dwelling with a single storey shed outbuilding set to the rear boundary. The existing dwelling has been previously extended through a two-storey side (south-western) extension in a hipped roof format. Furthermore, two single storey pitched roof extensions have been developed to the rear with a patio area between. In terms of existing materials, the dwelling is composed of brick at ground floor level, tile hanging at first floor level, concrete roof tiles and leaded windows and oriel windows at first floor level.

In terms of the site's locality, the application dwelling is set within a cluster of traditional Sussex vernacular dwellings built by Harold Turner. Each dwelling is set within a relatively generous plot size with a regular rhythm in gaps and separation distances between each property.

With regard to policy constraints, the site is located within the Haywards Heath and Lindfield Built Up Area. There is an existing tree-preservation order to the front of the site and is identified being set within an area of townscape character. The application dwelling has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposal would develop a first-floor side (north-eastern) elevation extension and would remove the existing cat slide roof pitch and match the existing ridge height with a hipped roof format. The proposed extension would have a maximum depth of circa 6.1m, have a width of 2.2m, measure at 4.9m high to the eaves and 8.1m high to the ridge. Proposed external materials would comprise tile hanging at first floor and matching roof tiles.

The proposal would also install a rooflight to the principal (south-eastern) roof pitch and would utilise a conservation model.

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 the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural 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:

DP26: Character and Design

DP34: Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets

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

Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan (Made March 2016)

Policy 7 - Areas of Townscape Character

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 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:

DPS1 - Climate Change

DPS2 - Sustainable Design and Construction

DPB1 - Character and Design

DPB2 - Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets

DPS2: Sustainable Design and Construction

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)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 is a material consideration.

Paragraphs 2, 8, 11, 39, 48, 131, 135, 139, 207, 208, 209, 210, 212-215, 216, 219 & 220.

National Design Guide (Published January 2021)

ASSESSMENT

It is considered that the main issues that need to be considered in the determination of this application are as follows;

- Impact on Design and Character, Including Heritage Assets
- Impact on Neighbouring Amenities
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Impact on Design and Character, Including Heritage Assets

Policy DP34 of the District Plan states among other matters that:

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.

DP26 of the 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 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'*

The application site is also identified as forming part of an Area of Townscape Character under Policy 7 of the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan. It sets out:

'The Neighbourhood Plan designates the following areas as Areas of Townscape Character, as shown on the Proposals Map:

- i. Summerhill Lane/West Common*
- ii. Sunte Avenue/Hickmans Lane/Denmans Lane*
- iii. The Welkin*
- iv. The Wilderness*
- v. Portsmouth Wood and Portsmouth Wood Close*

Development proposals in an Area of Townscape Character will be supported, provided applicants can demonstrate they have had regard to their impact on the character and appearance of the area and have sought to retain features important to the character of the area, as defined in the Lindfield Village Design Statement. In particular, proposals should:

- i. retain trees, frontage hedgerows and walls which contribute to the character and appearance of the area;*
- ii. retain areas of open space, (including private gardens) which are open to public view and contribute to the character and appearance of the area; and*
- iii. avoid the demolition of existing buildings which contribute to the character and appearance of the area'.*

Paragraph 216 of the NPPF notes:

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 judgment will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Esmerelda Cottage, whilst undesignated is considered to possess architectural and aesthetic value within its local context. As a non-designated heritage asset, the dwelling is considered to possess a mid-level of interest within the local context.

Principle DG49 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide states:

'Extensions should typically use simple, uncomplicated building forms to compliment 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.'

Principle DG50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide elaborates further on what constitutes 'good design' in relation to side extensions:

Side extensions should normally be subservient to the original dwelling and typically be set-back from the front of the house to help define the original building.

The gaps between dwellings can sometimes positively contribute to articulating (for example, through the consistent rhythm of repeated houses) and adding interest in a street frontage or by providing views / visible connections to the surrounding countryside. Side extensions will therefore need to appropriately respond to the character of the street form and will not normally be accepted where they close an important gap and view.

The existing dwelling has previously been extended to the side elevation through a substantial side (south-western) elevation extension which utilises an inset from the original dwelling's principal elevation. As noted within the Conservation Officer's response, the application dwelling was likely designed with a degree of symmetry in mind to reflect the neighbouring dwelling at Linden immediately to the northeast.

The application has been revised since the previous refusal under DM/25/2139 and has removed the rear dormer as well as retaining the central chimney stack. It was commented in response to the proposed development by the Conservation Officer that the current proposal was an improvement on this previous scheme.

The Conservation Officer considered that the proposed side extension would remove the characteristic side cat-slide roof as well as the original dormer window. It was considered by the Conservation Officer that whilst the property has previously been extended at two storey level to the opposite side, the incremental increase would result in an adverse impact on the dwellings original features.

The Conservation Officer therefore concluded that the proposal would result in a level of harm towards the non-designated heritage asset which would likely be placed at the mid level of the scale. Although the previous refusal found this element in isolation to result in an undue increase in the bulk, size and massing, a number of what were considered to be the most harmful elements have been removed from the current proposal, including the chimney stack and rear dormer.

Due to the proposed quantum of unacceptable works causing harm towards the non-designated heritage asset, the previous scheme was refused. The current proposal reduces the quantum of works significantly. The proposed first floor side extension has been reduced in bulk from the previously proposed development, and the proposal is therefore considered to result in a neutral impact. Therefore, the Conservation Officer's assessment is not agreed with in this instance.

A new rooflight would be added to the principal roof pitch in a central position within the original dwellings roof slope, albeit set towards the ridge. Whilst this rooflight would be set within a visually prominent position in terms of public vantage points, it is considered that the use of a conservation style unit would help mitigate the rooflights visual impact. It is therefore considered that the proposal could not be resisted in terms of this element in isolation.

The above alterations are considered to be acceptable within the context of the streetscene with the characteristic chimney retained. This would reflect the other properties within the defined area of townscape character. Furthermore, the use of matching and sympathetic materials would help the proposal embed within the locality.

In light of the above, it is considered that the scheme has been amended to reduce the quantum of harmful elements that together led to the previous refusal. The proposal is considered to result in an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the townscape character area and would accord with Policies DP34 and DP26 of the District Plan and Policy 7 of the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenities

In terms of impact upon neighbouring amenities, Policy DP26 in part seeks to ensure that development:

'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 DP29);'

The immediate neighbouring property to the north-east at Linden features a side (south-west) dormer window at first floor as well as a number of ground floor windows to the same elevation. The neighbouring dormer window is considered to be limited in existing outlook and utilises glazing bars throughout.

Principle DG47 of the Design Guide states among other matters that all dwellings should benefit from daylight and sunlight levels that conform to BRE (Better Regulation Executive) standards. Further guidance is set out within the "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice" document. The "25 degree test" can be applied when the centre of the impacted window is measured in reference to the proposed development opposite. If the development falls within a 25-degree angle drawn from a horizontal line, it is likely that the proposal will have an adverse impact on the daylight and sunlight received by the window.

The aforementioned first floor side dormer window at the neighbouring property would likely pass the 25-degree test due to the extensions offset from the shared boundary and hipped roof form. With regard to the ground floor windows, these fail the 25 degree test in the existing arrangement and serve a non-habitable kitchen and dining room.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered to comply with the provisions of DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan in terms of 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 development is considered to result in an acceptable impact with regard to its impact on the non-designated heritage asset as well as the character and appearance of the locality and would result in an acceptable impact with regard to neighbouring amenities.

For the reasons set out within the report, the proposal would comply with Policies DP34 and DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and Policy 7 of the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Stefan Galyas