

Peter Davies

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 October 2025 09:01
To: planninginfo; Peter Davies
Subject: Re: Application Reference: DM/25/2118 - 16 Turners View, Cuckfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5SW

Sirs,

I have seen the revised details for the above application in respect of the proposed dormer window. Whilst we saw no issue with the previous proposal, as only a very limited number of immediate neighbours would ever see the dormer in any event, I wish to confirm that we have no objection to the revised scheme. For clarity, we remain in support of the scheme overall as before, and would refer you to the points we made in our earlier response to the planning application dated 8th September, as these points all still apply equally to the revised proposal.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]
4 Turners View, Cuckfield

On 8 Sep 2025, at 17:25, [REDACTED] wrote:

Please see my email below regarding the above application.

I am forwarding this to you as I have received an Out of Office message from Mr. Davies, which suggests he will not return until after the end of the consultation period for this application - which is somewhat unfortunate!

I would therefore be grateful if you could confirm that these representations had been received and duly logged in respect of this application.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]
Subject: Application Reference: DM/25/2118 - 16 Turners View, Cuckfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5SW
Date: 8 September 2025 at 17:05:38 BST
To: peter.davies@midsussex.gov.uk

Application Reference: DM/25/2118

16 Turners View Cuckfield Haywards Heath West Sussex RH17 5SW - Proposed ground floor side extension and loft conversion with a contemporary dormer to create additional habitable space, together with the construction of a separate garden shed for storage.

Dear Mr Davies,

I am writing to you on behalf of my wife and myself, as neighbours to the above application at Turners View, Cuckfield. However, I also write in my capacity as a practicing development planner and chartered transport planning professional.

This householder application comprises three elements:

- an extension into the loft of the property, including a new north-facing dormer window;
- a ground floor single-storey extension on the south side of the property to the kitchen and dining area; and,
- a larger garden storage building on the location of the current shed.

These three elements have quite different characteristics, and they do, in my view, need to be considered separately in terms of their respective planning merits. Therefore, I have provided comments on each element below.

The Parish Council Response

However, before doing so, I have seen from the planning portal that the Parish Council has already objected to the proposal. They have referenced policy CNP10(a) of the Neighbourhood Plan with regard to the scale, height and form of the scheme and have also referenced the original planning consent for the Hanlye View site of which the proposal (and our home) form a part.

The Parish Council do not set out why they have interpreted Policy CNP10(a) as being a limiting factor in the case of this development. Having considered the wording of the policy, it seems unreasonable to suggest that the proposal scheme does not meet the aspirations of this policy as adopted. The scale of the ground floor extension is in keeping with the overall footprint of the building, adding 19.77 sq.m to a building footprint of 93.0 sq.m (21.25%) and only increasing the original Gross Floor Area by 11.7%.

Although a planning condition to the original consent on the site removed Permitted Development rights from the site, nevertheless the criteria that would apply in respect of PD does provide sensible guidance for the consideration of whether the proposed extension is in scale and proportion to the original house and hence could be considered appropriate. In reality, the proposed extension is well within the parameters that would be allowed under PD rights, being no more than 3.0m from the existing building line into the rear garden of the house (noting that the house is orientated north-south, despite the main access door being on the western elevation).

The criteria of height in Policy CNP10(a) does not apply, as the height of the building is unchanged.

Similarly the form element does not appear relevant, as there are many hundreds of examples of dormer windows in Cuckfield, some that appear to have been original features and some that were likely added to the building later. These appear variously on both older buildings in the conservation area, and in more modern and contemporary examples on newer buildings all around the village. There are also numerous examples of flat-roofed extensions to houses in the wider village. Therefore, in my view, it is difficult to see where the form proposed at 16 Turners View does not meet the requirements of policy CNP10(a). Indeed, if these elements of the policy are to be engaged in objecting to the proposal then I would suggest that the Parish Council needs to explain how it is applying the policy in the context of this proposal in particular.

Loft Extension and Dormer

The addition of a dormer window to the northern elevation of the house will alter the appearance of this side of the house, and will also be visible to some extent from the east and west, where the triangle elevation of the dormer will be evident rising from the existing roof line. The dormer will not be visible from the north, as the house is hidden from Hanlye Lane and the AONB land to the north by a substantial and established tree belt. The house is not currently visible from the bridleway that runs from Hanlye Lane towards the Borde Hill estate on the northern side of Hanlye Lane, and is only visible in occasional and fleeting glimpses during Winter when there is less foliage within the tree belt. The addition of the dormer to this elevation is very unlikely to be perceived as a change to these glimpsed views.

As already mentioned, the use of dormer windows within roofs is part of the Mid-Sussex vernacular, and is very much a part of the building forms in and around Cuckfield. Although the original design concept for the Hanlye View site did not include dormers, it could very well have done so. The Design & Access Statement that was submitted with the Hanlye View application states in respect of Townscape (section 7.2) that:

"The development is based upon a contemporary interpretation of traditional vernacular buildings. The development includes three distinct townscape groupings defined by their materials and form."

The three townscape elements then reference such vernacular elements as the use of weathered timber boarding, gable end frontage elevations, locally characteristic clay tile clad upper floors, cat-slide roofs and diaper pattern brickwork. It is evident that the site was designed with a very strong reference to local vernacular detailing, and that the use of dormers would have fitted into this approach should the designers have wished to incorporate them, as they are evident in abundance across Cuckfield, and even close to the site itself at the Lodge building on

Hanlye Lane and Horsgate House itself - which notably has third storey dormers and end gables.

Therefore, it is evident that the principle of incorporating or adding dormers to residential homes in Cuckfield is part of the long-established design characteristics of the area.

The dormer as proposed on the application does feature a zinc-clad finish at either end. This creates a modern and contemporary material for a dormer, which is consistent, in my view, with the contemporary interpretation of the vernacular style adopted by the development as a whole. It is, however, not a material that features elsewhere on the development to any great extent, and hence, if it were considered inappropriate, the end treatment could feature tile hanging which is used on the neighbouring houses and which would not, therefore, be out of keeping. Alternatively wooden cladding to replicate the sweet chestnut timber cladding that features elsewhere on the house itself would be another alternative. This change, if considered desirable by the planning authority, could be dealt with through a suitable planning condition.

In my view, the addition of a dormer facing northwards is acceptable in principle and could be achieved with a suitable cladding material if the proposed zinc material was deemed unsuitable.

Ground Floor Extension

The ground floor extension, as referenced above, does not represent a large scale addition to the footprint of the building, and is not likely to be excessive in the context of the relatively large plot that the house sits within.

The extension will be visible from the road (Turners View) as it passes the house, as the house sits slightly higher than the road, and also from the neighbouring gardens at No. 12 Turners View to the south and Nos 6 and 4 Turners View (No.4 being our house) to the west. However, the extension is far enough away to not constitute an over-looking issue, and the rear bi-fold doors at No.16 are already visible from the road and gardens as the existing house due to the slightly higher level of this house compared to the rest of the site.

The oblique angle of the views here means that the extension is unlikely to create any amenity issues with regard to Nos. 6 and 4 Turners View, whilst Nos.12 and 14 Turners View are orientated perpendicular to the proposal, and only have a secondary ground floor window, which is not overlooked due to garden fencing, and an opaque first-floor bathroom window on the northern elevation facing the proposed extension at No.16.

The extension will overlook the neighbouring garden at No.12, but there is already a screen in the garden of No.16 to prevent over-looking, and the bin store and rear access for Nos 12 and 14 and the driveway of No.16 run between the two plots. The extension will bring the wall of No.16

closer to the garden of Nos.12 & 14, but not to the extent that this is likely to be intrusive, as it remains more than ten metres away even then.

Garden Storage

The proposed garden storage building is effectively a replacement for an existing shed that is already on the site in the same position. The application information is not definitive, but it appears that the new storage building will be slightly larger than the existing one - comprising 13.7 sq.m instead of the current c. 9.0 sq.m from measuring the drawing submitted.

The buildings will be of similar height, and sit in an area that is enclosed by fencing on three sides. On this basis, it is difficult to see that the new storage building would have any greater impact than the current one.

Addition of Development Footprint at Hanlye View Site

It should also be noted that there is some leeway for additional development to be accommodated at the Hanlye View site, as the total floor area of development permitted under the Hanlye View planning permission has not, in fact, been constructed across the site. The approved Proposed Site Plan (Ref. 1660 PA 010) shows four Garden Rooms across the site, in plots 2, 4, 5 & 7. These Garden Rooms are each shown as being rectangular, with an external area of 22.5 sq.m, and therefore comprising 90 sq.m overall. In fact, much smaller Garden Rooms have been provided by the developer, each comprising only 11 sq.m, and comprising 44 sq.m in total.

This is relevant to this application, as the reason given for the imposition of the planning condition removing Permitted Development rights at the site was to prevent over-development of the site. It is therefore correct to assume that the Council considered the acceptable footprint for development on the site, before there was a risk of over-development that would require a separate planning consent, included the footprint shown on the Proposed Site Plan drawing. As this footprint has not, in actuality, been delivered, and as these plots have been completed then the total permitted footprint will not be achieved as part of the implementation of the original Hanlye View planning permission.

This means that there is effectively 46 sq.m of built form that has been assessed and approved on the site, but which has not been implemented. (There have been two subsequent householder applications - one for a greenhouse (No.4 Turners View) and one for a pergola (No.6 Turners View), but these did not make reference to or rely on this additional floor area, and were determined on their own merits.)

The proposed extension at No16 Turners View would (by my estimate from the plans submitted) add a further c.25 sq.m of developed footprint on the site, which would be well within the further 46 sq.m that has already been approved in principle as being an appropriate level of development across the site as a whole.

This means that, firstly, the additional extension and garden storage building cannot be considered to result in over-development of the site, since, if approved, the overall development on the site would remain below that which has been approved in order to prevent over-development, as per the planning condition to remove PD rights.

And second, at least as far as the scale and overall development of the site is concerned (a point alluded to by the Parish Council) both the extension and the small additional garden storage area proposed can be considered to fall within the already consented built footprint allowed on the site in any event. Hence, the scale of the proposal should not be considered to be unacceptable within the context of the Hanlye View site as a whole.

Conclusions

For the reasons set out above, we consider that the proposed development at 16 Turners View should be deemed acceptable in terms of both policy and in the context of the overall planning consent that was approved at Hanlye View.

Therefore, we are pleased to confirm that we SUPPORT the proposed planning application.

Yours sincerely,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact a signature.