

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/0364	Case Officer:	Deborah Lynn
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Single-storey extension to the principal elevation, proposed cladding and replacement anthracite windows to principal elevation and new windows and doors to side elevations.		
Site:	23 Blackthorns, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2AX, , ,		
Validation Date	12 Feb 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	1 May 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	11 May 2026
Target Date:	9 Apr 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Deborah Lynn

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Joanne Fisher	Date:	11 May 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/0364

**23 Blackthorns, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2AX, ,
Single-storey extension to the principal elevation, proposed cladding and replacement anthracite windows to principal elevation and new windows and doors to side elevations.
Mr And Mrs Reeve**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

MSDC Flood Risk and Drainage

No objection on flood risk grounds.

As an advisory, we would suggest the Applicant considers resistance and resilience measures suggested within the EA standing advice and implements any they deem appropriate due to the increased flood risk in the vicinity of this as a residential site (which are classified as 'more vulnerable').

Southern Water

No objections.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to the application.

INTRODUCTION

This application seeks planning permission for a single storey extension to the principal elevation together with proposed cladding and replacement anthracite windows. New windows and doors are proposed to the side elevations.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

LF/103/98 - Replace existing flat roofs with pitched roofs over front bay windows. Permission granted 03.01.2001.

00/02492/FUL - Proposed conservatory to rear. Permission granted 03.01.2001.

DM/17/1351 - Demolition of existing garage/conservatory/shed and erection of new two storey extension to side and rear, and single storey extension to rear. Permission granted 01.06.2017.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

No. 23 Blackthorns is a detached 1960s house situated on the western side of the road within a row of similar properties. The dwellinghouse is well set back from the road and benefits from a generous sized driveway to the front. A two storey extension has been added to the southern side of the house, which includes an integral garage. Various extensions have been added to the original house over the years.

In terms of planning policy, the site lies within the built up area of Lindfield. It also falls within a designated Great Crested Newt Red Impact Risk Zone.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Proposed plans show that the existing bay windows and pitched roof canopy to the front of the dwellinghouse will be replaced with a single storey extension that spans the width of the dwellinghouse.

Proposed plans indicate that the single storey extension will project approximately 3.1 metres from the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse and will measure 10.65 metres wide by 3.4 metres high. A

shallow mono-pitched roof is proposed with gable projection above the front entrance that is inset from the adjoining front walls.

The extension will include a garage door that serves a storage area with the existing integral garage proposed to be converted to form a gym and bar. The extension will also provide a hallway and office. It will be finished with white render to the external walls and concrete pantiles to match the existing roof.

Other external works are proposed to the dwellinghouse, including installing dark blue/grey Cedral weatherboarding to the first floor of the principal elevation and replacing existing white framed upvc windows to the front elevation with anthracite grey framed upvc windows.

A new glazed door is proposed to be installed on the southern side elevation of the dwellinghouse to serve the gym with 3 no. ground windows proposed to the northern elevation to serve an office and sitting room.

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:

DP21 - Transport

DP26 - Character and design

DP41 - Flood risk

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 Neighbourhood Plan was made on the 23rd March 2016.

There are no policies deemed relevant.

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:

DPS2 - Sustainable design and construction
DPS4 - Flood risk and drainage
DPB1 - Character and design

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)

ASSESSMENT

The main issues deemed relevant to the consideration of this application are:

- Design and impact on character of area
- Impact on neighbouring amenities
- Parking provision
- Flood risk and drainage.

Design and impact on character of area

Policy DP26 of the District Plan relates to character and design and requires all proposals, including alterations and extensions, to be well designed and reflect the distinctive character of the towns and villages while being sensitive to the countryside as well as addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape.

The Council's Design Guide SPD is also a material planning consideration with design principles DG49 and DG50 deemed relevant to this application.

Principle DG49 relates to general principles for extensions and recommends that 'extensions should typically use simple, uncomplicated building forms to complement 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.'

DG50 relates to front and side extensions and states in part that:

'Front extensions are more likely to be acceptable where the building line is staggered or where the dwelling is set well back from the road. They are less likely to be acceptable in streets with a strong consistent building form as they risk disrupting the underlying order.'

Where front extensions are considered acceptable, they should normally be limited to a modest single storey or porch-type extension that reflect the character of the existing property.'

The proposed front extension is considered appropriate in terms of design, form and scale to the existing dwellinghouse and surrounding properties. Whilst the proposed block and site plans show that the extension will protrude beyond the front building line of adjoining properties, the extension will be sited approximately 9.8 metres from the boundary of the property with the highway at its closest point. As the proposed extension will be well set back from the road and the properties are not laid out in a uniform line, being on a slight bend in the road, it is not considered that the proposal would appear visually prominent as to detract from the character and appearance of the street scene. Various front extensions have been added within the street scene and consequently the proposal is considered in keeping.

The proposed white render finish to the extension and dark blue/grey weatherboarding at first floor level is not considered wholly out of keeping with the area and will reflect the external materials at properties no. 31 and 45. The proposed anthracite grey windows will represent a contrast in a street scene where white framed windows predominate, however are not considered to have a harmful effect upon the appearance and character of the area.

In view of the above, the proposal is considered to accord with policy DP26 of the District Plan.

Impact on amenity

Policy DP26 of the District Plan refers to amenity and states that development proposals should '*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 proposal is not considered to cause significant harm to neighbouring amenities in terms of affecting light levels, outlook or privacy. New windows and doors are proposed to the flank walls of the dwellinghouse, however as these are situated at ground floor level, they will be screened from neighbouring properties by existing boundary treatments and consequently are not likely to result in undue overlooking.

The proposal therefore accords with policy DP26 of the District Plan.

Parking provision

Policy DP21 of the District Plan relates to Transport and states in part that development proposals should provide 'adequate car parking for the development, taking into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the development and the availability and opportunities for public transport; and with the relevant Neighbourhood Plan where applicable.'

The proposed development would result in the loss of an integral garage space and will reduce the length of the existing driveway. However, parking provision for approximately 3 cars should remain within the site.

The West Sussex County Council Car Parking Demand Calculator recommends that a dwelling in this location with 4 or more bedrooms has 3 off road parking spaces.

Sufficient off road parking should therefore remain at the property, thereby according with policy DP21 of the District Plan.

Flood Risk and Drainage

District Plan policy DP41 relates to flood risk and states in part that:

'Particular attention will be paid to those areas of the District that have experienced flooding in the past and proposals for development should seek to reduce the risk of flooding by achieving a reduction from existing run-off rates.'

The site lies within flood zones 1, 2 and 3, with the Scrase Stream running along the rear boundary of the site. The site is therefore at a very low to high risk of fluvial flooding and also lies within an area of very low to low surface water flood risk.

The Council's Flood Risk and Drainage Team has raised no objection to the proposed development on flood risk grounds, however, has recommended that the applicant consider resistance and resilience measures suggested within the Environment Agency standing advice. An informative can be added to the decision notice in this respect.

The proposal therefore accords with policy DP41 of the District Plan.

Other matters

Great Crested Newts

The site lies within a designated Great Crested Newt Red Impact Risk Zone which indicates that there is a high risk of Great Crested Newts on the site. Having regard to the residential nature of the proposal and scale of the development, it is not considered that the proposal would have any impact upon newts or their habitat. However, an informative can be attached to the planning consent to advise the applicant on action to be taken should Great Crested Newts be found during construction works.

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 extension and external alterations are considered acceptable in terms of design, form and scale to the existing dwellinghouse and surrounding properties and should not detract from the character and appearance of the street scene. Nor should the proposal cause significant harm to neighbouring amenities. The proposal therefore accords with policies DP21, DP26 and DP41 of the Mid Sussex District Plan.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Deborah Lynn