

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 25 February 2026 17:13:34 UTC+00:00
To: "Catherine Cardin" <Catherine.Cardin@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: DM/25/3197 59 Fairfield Road, BH

Hi Cathy

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

The proposal has been revised in terms of the detail of the replacement bay window at ground floor front, and of the design of the proposed new dormer window to the rear. In the context, these amendments are considered to meet the concerns previously raised and the proposal is now considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This meets the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

I would recommend the following conditions:

- Details of roofing and facing materials
- New brickwork to match existing adjacent original work in colour, texture and bonding pattern, and in colour, texture and style of pointing
- Detailed drawings, at an appropriate large scale, including sections, and annotated to show materials and finishes, of new windows. Your drawings should include glazing bar detail
- New rooflights to be flush fitting, metal framed, conservation style rooflights.

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 <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>

Sent: 19 January 2026 16:29

To: Catherine Cardin <Catherine.Cardin@midsussex.gov.uk>

Subject: DM/25/3197 59 Fairfield Road, BH

Hi Catherine

Comments on the above planning application.

59 Fairfield Road is an unlisted building located within the Fairfield Conservation Area of Burgess Hill. The property is one half of an originally handed pair of late 19th/early 20th century houses located in a relatively prominent position adjacent to the southern edge of the Fairfield Recreation Ground, such that both the side and rear of the building are visible in public views from the park, and from the public right of way which runs along its southern side. The house pair have suffered from unsympathetic alterations but retain some period features, and make a slight positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Area.

The current proposal is for alterations and extensions to the property comprising replacement of the original canted bay window to the front elevation which has been previously removed, a side return extension adjacent to the existing original, but extended, rear wing, and a loft conversion including a dormer window to the rear roof slope and rooflights to the front and rear roof slopes and the side slope of the rear wing.

The proposed reinstatement of the canted bay window to the front elevation is welcomed, as this reinstates an original feature of the elevation and reinforces the intended symmetry of the façade of the villa pair. I would however suggest that the windows to the bay window should be sash (or sash type) rather than the proposed Georgian style casements, which are not original and detract from the character of the building, notwithstanding that they are present to the first floor.

To the rear of the house, the side return extension to the original rear wing is not considered contentious, subject to detail. This is appropriately subordinate to the

building, and will not detract from its appearance in public views from the adjacent PROW and park, in which it will be largely screened by the adjacent close boarded fence.

Although the principle of a loft conversion is not considered contentious, and I have no objection to the proposed rooflights provided that these are flush fitting, conservation style rooflights (not velux types as currently described to the rear roof slopes), the proposed dormer window is over scaled and is set too high in the roof slope. I would recommend that this is reduced in size and set down in the roof slope, away from the roof ridge. The heavy cheeks flanking the window should be reduced, and the form of the window amended to a flat-arched sash rather than the 'Gothic' casement shown. Again, I am aware of the existing non-original casements to this elevation, but the addition of further unsympathetic window in a high and visually prominent position would only further detract from the original character of the building.

In summary, although the principle of the works is not considered contentious, aspects of the proposal require amendment to ensure that the proposal preserves the character and appearance of the building and of the Conservation Area, meeting the requirements of adopted District Plan Policy DP35 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

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