

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 27 March 2025 15:40:08 UTC+00:00
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>



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>



No ID? You can apply for free voter ID
Find out more at
electoralcommission.org.uk/voterID
or call 0800 328 0280