

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/0007	Case Officer:	Tracie Axford
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed single storey ground floor rear/side extension		
Site:	Oakley Lodge, 13 High Street, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2HG, ,		
Validation Date	6 Feb 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	13 Mar 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Refusal	Recommendation Date:	8 May 2026
Target Date:	3 Apr 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Tracie Axford</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	11 May 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/0007

**Oakley Lodge, 13 High Street, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2HG,
Proposed single storey ground floor rear/side extension
Mr Sherry**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Southern Water: no objections

Conservation Officer: *'The application site is one half of a late 19th/early 20th century handed villa pair located within the Lindfield Conservation Area. The current proposal is for a single storey extension to the rear of the house, taking in an existing single storey addition sitting against the boundary with the attached neighbour, and wrapping around the base of the original two storey rear wing.'*

Oakley Lodge and it's attached neighbour are one of three adjacent similar pairs which retain a strong period character and group value, making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area. To the rear of the group, the characteristic T shaped plan of each pair is still generally appreciable at first floor, but at ground floor a variety of extensions of different forms and designs are in place. The attached neighbour at no. 15, for example, has a recently constructed flat roofed extension of a contemporary aesthetic.

In this context, the principle of a rear extension is not considered contentious. I do however have some concerns regarding the footprint of the addition in terms of its width, in that this is shown projecting beyond the side elevation of the original house. In my opinion this will not be acceptable, as the extension will not as result read as appropriately subservient to the host dwelling, and will also be visible in public views along the side of the house from the High Street. The width of the addition should be reduced so that it sits no further to the southwest than the line of the side elevation to the original building where this steps in from the main front range (...).

The extension is shown as having a contemporary aesthetic, with an asymmetric roof running back to a gable facing onto the rear garden. In other circumstances, this might not be considered an appropriate approach to an addition to a period building within a Conservation Area, in particular where the property is part of a cohesive group. However, on balance, given the lack of a consistent design to the additions to the neighbouring properties it is not considered that an objection on design grounds to this aspect of the proposal could be sustained, subject to the above-mentioned amendment to the width of the addition.

In summary, while the principle of the proposal and the design approach are considered acceptable, the scale of the addition and in particular its width require amendment to ensure that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area are preserved, meeting the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35, the Council's adopted Design Guide and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Lindfield Parish Council have no objection to this application.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for a proposed single storey ground floor rear/side extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The site is located within the Lindfield built up area boundary and within the Lindfield Conservation Area. The site is also located within a West Sussex County Council Archaeological Notification Area for the Historic Core of Lindfield.

The existing site consists of a two-storey semi-detached residential dwelling which is characterised by bare brown brick walls, grey slate roof tiles and white fenestration. The dwelling is one half of a semi-detached pair of 19th century houses which retain a number of original features. The residential properties within the surrounding area are varied in their scale and design and they are characterised by a variety of external materials. Many of the properties within the locality have benefited from extensions and alterations of differing scales and designs. Directly opposite the application site is the Grade II Listed Pelham House.

APPLICATION DETAILS

This application seeks permission for a single-storey rear/side extension with windows, doors and rooflights. The rear extension will have a width of approximately 5.8 metres and will extend approximately 3 metres beyond the furthest rear elevation. The proposed extension will also wrap around the side elevation and extend beyond the existing side elevation by approximately 1 metre.

The proposed extension will have a pitched roof and will be in materials to match, however it is proposed that uPVC will be used for the windows and doors.

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 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

DP35 - Conservation Areas

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.

Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan

The Lindfield Neighbourhood Plan was made in March 2016.

No relevant policies.

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 the 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

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.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024)

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

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 the character/appearance of the Conservation Area*
- Impact on neighbouring properties*
- Biodiversity Net Gain*

Impact on Design and the character/appearance of the Conservation Area

The site is located within the Lindfield Conservation Area, as designated in 1969. A Conservation Area is defined as an area of "special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance".

The below assessment is made whilst being mindful of this guidance and having regard to the statutory duty of the Council, as the Local Planning Authority, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the heritage asset (the Lindfield Conservation Area), the site being within its boundary, and any features of special interest, as set out in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Policy DP35 of the District Plan 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:

- 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;
- 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;
- 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;
- 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;
- Activities such as markets, crafts or other activities which contribute to the special character and appearance of the conservation area are supported;
- New pavements, roads and other surfaces reflect the materials and scale of the existing streets and surfaces in the conservation area.

Development will also protect the setting of the conservation area and in particular views into and out of the area.

New buildings of outstanding or innovative design may be acceptable in conservation areas provided that their impact would not cause material harm to the area.'

With regards to general design matters, Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan requires all development and surrounding spaces, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings and replacement dwellings, to be well designed and reflect the distinctive character of the towns and villages.

Design principles DG49, DG50 and DG51 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide are also of relevance to the application.

The Council's Conservation Officer has been consulted on the proposal and has expressed concerns regarding the footprint of the addition in terms of its width, in that this is shown projecting beyond the side elevation of the original house. The conservation officer added that this will not be acceptable, as the extension will not read as appropriately subservient to the host dwelling, and will also be visible in public views along the side of the house from the High Street. Advice was given on how this issue could be addressed but, no amendments to the design of the extension have been made.

In general terms, the extension would reflect the architectural detail of the host dwelling incorporating external facing brickwork and a pitched tiled roof. The proposed doors and windows will be dark grey in colour, introducing a more contemporary appearance. As the fenestration will not be visible from the public realm, it is not considered that it would result in any harm to the streetscene, or the character of the Conservation Area.

However the Planning Officer agrees with the assessment of the Conservation Officer in that represents an unsympathetic addition to the property due to the width of the extension beyond the existing flank wall, meaning that the proposal is visible from the public realm, which would detract from the contribution the house makes to the character and appearance of the Lindfield Conservation Area. As such the application is considered contrary to policies DP26 and DP35 of the District Plan. In terms of the NPPF, the proposal will result in less than substantial harm to the heritage asset, such that the balancing exercise set out in paragraph 215 will apply.

Paragraph 215 states that, 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.

As the extension is proposed on a private dwelling, it is not considered that there are any public benefits which would outweigh the identified harm to the Conservation Area.

Impact on 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 Policy DP29);'

The proposal is of a modest single storey nature. It will not extend beyond the rear boundary of the neighbouring adjoining property at no 15 High Street. There is a reasonable gap between no 13 and no 11 and it is not considered that the increase in width to the side extension of the property will result in any significant impacts to the neighbour at no. 11. Taking into account the above the works would not cause significant harm to the amenities of nearby residents including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight, and noise, air and light pollution. The works are therefore, considered to comply with the abovementioned part of policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.

Archaeology

Policy DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan takes into account a range of heritage assets, including archaeology, in a manner appropriate to their significance. The application site is located in an Archaeological Notification Area, as it has multi-period features. Due to the nature of the proposed development it is not considered there would be an adverse impact on this heritage asset; however a condition would be attached to any consent to ensure that if any remains are discovered appropriate action would be undertaken.

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

In conclusion by virtue of the extensions projection beyond the flank wall of the existing property, it is considered that the proposal would appear as a unsympathetic addition to the property that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the application property and the wider Conservation Area. The harm to the significance of the Conservation Area is considered to 'less than substantial' and having regard to paragraph 215 of the NPPF, it is not considered that there are public benefits that would outweigh the identified harm. As such the the proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policies DP26 and DP35 of the District Plan, the MSDC Design Guide, the requirements of the NPPF and Section 72 of the Listed Building and Conservation Area Act 1990.

Decision: *Refusal*

Case Officer: *Tracie Axford*