

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/0826	Case Officer:	Rachel Richardson
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	First floor extensions over garage and rear extension.		
Site:	17 Fairford Close, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 3EF, , , ,		
Validation Date	30 Mar 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	8 May 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	8 Jun 2026
Target Date:	25 May 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Rachel Richardson</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Steven King</i>	Date:	8 Jun 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/0826

**17 Fairford Close, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 3EF, , ,
First floor extensions over garage and rear extension.
Mr And Mrs Relf**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Conservation Officer: No objection. The proposal is considered to preserve the setting of the Heath Conservation Area.

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Haywards Heath Town Council makes no comment.

INTRODUCTION

Permission is sought to extend at first floor over the garage and at first floor over the rear extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/16/0984 Rear two storey and single storey extension. Permission 03.05.2016

DM/21/0645 First floor side extension together with associated internal and external alterations.
Permission 26.05.2021

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

No 17 Fairford Close is a detached four bed house located in an established residential close of similarly designed houses. The house has been extended at ground and first floor at the rear.

The house is set back in an elevated position from the road and the land slopes steeply uphill from the front to the rear of the plot.

For the purposes of planning policy the site lies within the built-up area boundary as defined in the District Plan and the rear half of the back garden is within the conservation area.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposal is to extend at first floor over the garage which is on the northern side of the house. The development approved under DM/21/0645 was not carried out and this application is an alternative design to that permission. The difference between the two applications is that the proposed side extension under the current application will extend over the front part of the garage which is forward of the principal elevation of the original house. The application also proposes an extension at first floor on the rear and towards the southern part of the property. It would extend the existing first floor rear extension by a further 2.6m making it flush with the rear elevation of the existing ground floor extension.

Materials are to match existing.

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 Haywards Heath 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.

Neighbourhood Plan

Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan 2014-2031. Made December 2016.

Relevant policies:

Policy E9 Reinforcing local character/design

Policy H9 Extensions to existing dwellings

Other Legislation

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

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:

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)

ASSESSMENT

Character and Appearance

Policy DP26 of the District Plan states in part that:

'All development and surrounding spaces, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings and replacement dwellings, will be well designed and reflect the distinctive character of the towns and villages while being sensitive to the countryside. All applicants will be required to demonstrate that development:

- is of high quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace;*
- contributes positively to, and clearly defines, public and private realms and should normally be designed with active building frontages facing streets and public open spaces to animate and provide natural surveillance;*
- creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape;*
- protects open spaces, trees and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;*
- 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'*

Policy E9 (Design) of the HHNP has a similar ethos to DP26 referring to new development protecting and reinforcing local character and design elements must include regard to height, scale, spacing, layout, orientation, design and materials of buildings. HHNP Policy H9 (Extensions) states:

'Extensions to existing dwellings will be permitted where it meets the following criteria:

- o The scale, height and form fit unobtrusively with the existing building and the character of the street scene.*
- o Spacing between buildings would respect the character of the street scene.*
- o Gaps which provide views out to surrounding countryside are maintained.*
- o Materials are compatible with the materials of the existing building.*
- o The traditional boundary treatment of an area is retained and, where feasible reinforced.*
- o The privacy, daylight, sunlight and outlook of adjoining residents are safeguarded.'*

MSDG Principles DG49 (General Principles) states that, *'Extensions should respond to the design of the original dwelling and applicants will be expected to demonstrate how local character has informed the design proposal. Extensions should also normally be designed to be well-integrated with the existing scale, form and massing allowing the original building to remain the dominant element of the property whether it has one or several additions.'*

DG50 (front and side extensions) states that: *'Front and side extensions are typically visible from the public realm and will be resisted where they have an adverse impact on the street scene or the appearance of a dwelling.'*

DG51 (rear extensions) not visible from the street and do not negatively impact on neighbouring properties can be expressed in many forms but should have consideration for the character of the

existing building and the relationship of the extension with the side boundaries and adjacent buildings and gardens.

In terms of design, the proposed first floor side extension is considered to be integral to the form and character of the existing property and would have materials to match. All the properties are staggered in the Close so the forward position of the extension would not appear dominant or detract from the street scene.

The proposed rear extension would not be visible in the street scene and has been designed to be sympathetic to the existing dwelling. It would sit alongside an existing two storey extension at the adjoining property to the south.

Therefore, in terms of design and character, the proposed extensions are considered to be compliant with the above mentioned relevant policies.

Residential Amenity

District Plan Policy DP26 and Neighbourhood Plan Policy H9 are relevant in the determination of this application with regards to the impact of the changes on the residential amenities of the neighbouring residents. There is a conflict in the phrasing of these policies. Policy DP26 requires that, all applicants will be required to demonstrate that development does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of the new dwellings. In contrast Policy H9 states that extensions to existing dwellings will be permitted where the privacy, daylight, sunlight and outlook of adjoining residents are safeguarded.

Under section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 if a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan, the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approved or published. As such, Policy DP26 of the MSDP is considered to take precedence and therefore the test in this instance is whether the development causes significant harm to neighbouring amenities as outlined above.

In addition, Principle DG45 in the Design Guide refers to the need to consider privacy of existing and future residents and it is noted that privacy may be affected by the relationship of buildings to each other.

The proposed first floor side extension over the garage, would be forward of the principal elevation of No. 19, which is situated on its closest side and to the north of the application site. The distance between the two front facing elevations is about 1.7m. While the proposed extension would be visible from front first floor windows of No.19, it is considered that any harm caused to outlook would not be significant and therefore would comply with policy DP26 in this respect. Given the modest amount of projection it is also considered that there would be no significant harm resulting to the same windows of No 19 by reason of overshadowing, loss of daylight and or sunlight.

There are no side windows proposed. There would be a first floor rear bedroom window in the proposed side extension. However, there is very mature and tall screening along the shared boundary and there will always be a certain amount of overlooking at the rear on properties in a residential built up area. No significant harm would therefore result in terms of overlooking and or a loss of privacy.

As said above the proposed first floor rear extension will sit alongside and be short of an existing two storey extension on the property at No 15. No significant harm to residential amenity will therefore result for the occupants of No 15.

The proposals are considered to accord with the criteria of Policy DP26 of the District Plan, but also with the requirements of Policy H9 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan and the Design Guide principles.

on Setting of Conservation Area

Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states 'In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any powers under any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of conservation preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.'

Policy DP35 states in part that Development will also protect the setting of the conservation area and in particular the views into and out of the area.

Policy E9 of the HHNP states in part that , *'Proposals affecting a listed building, conservation area, building of local interest or public park of historic interest or their setting should preserve or enhance their special interest and/or distinctive character.'*

This is reiterated in section 16 of the NPPF and particularly at para 213 where any harm to the setting of a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification.

The Conservation Officer has commented as follows:

'The application site is an unlisted detached house located to the western side of Fairford Close, just outside the boundary of the Heath Conservation Area, within its setting. The house, which dates from the later part of the 20th century, is part of a development of similar properties in a neo-Georgian style, having brick elevations, a hipped tiled roof, sash style windows, and a columned and pedimented front entrance. To the northern side of the building is a single storey flat roofed garage which is set forward of the main façade, with single storey additions extending across the rear of the house. The house and the wider development are not of any particular age or architectural interest, and make at best a neutral contribution to the setting of the Conservation Area.'

There is also a Grade II listed building (Pooks Cottage) a short distance to the west. However, given the intervening development and further screening by planting I would not consider that the current proposal will affect its setting.

The current proposal is for an extension at first floor level above the existing garage to the northern end of the building, plus a further first floor extension above the single storey addition to the rear of the house at its southern end.

The proposed northern extension, in sitting above the garage, is partly forward of the main façade of the building and in other circumstances might be regarded as unduly bulky and visually prominent. However, I note that other houses within the same development have been extended in a similar manner, such that the forward projecting nature of the addition would not be out of keeping with the wider street scene. Given that this side of the house also faces away from the Conservation Area boundary I would not therefore object on ground of design or impact on the setting of the Area.

From the point of view of the impact on the setting of the Heath Conservation Area, the house backs onto the boundary, so that it would be the extensions to the rear both above the garage and to the southern end of the building which would be more visible. I would not however consider that these additions were harmful in this respect, given the context of the modern nature of the development and its limited contribution to the setting or significance of the Area.

On balance, therefore, the proposal is considered to preserve the setting of the Heath Conservation Area, meeting the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF. I would recommend the following conditions:

- *Brickwork to match existing adjacent work in colour, texture and bonding pattern and in colour, texture and style of pointing.*
- *Roofing material to match the existing tiles to the roof in colour, texture and profile.*
- *Eaves detailing to match existing in materials and profile.*
- *Windows to match the existing adjacent windows in material and colour, and in proportions and profile of the framing.'*

The Conservation Officer comments are agreed with, and the proposed development would protect the setting of the conservation area and the views into and out of the area in accordance with DP35. The extensions will be set down in height due to the fall in levels and the rear garden also benefits from substantial screening.

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

Overall, and for the reasons given above the proposed development is considered to be acceptable and is compliant with relevant policy criteria and national policy contained within the NPPF. As such, it is recommended that permission be granted.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Rachel Richardson