

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/3213	Case Officer:	Catherine Cardin
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Rear Extension.		
Site:	90 Renfields, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 4TG, , , ,		
Validation Date	19 Dec 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	24 Mar 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	19 Mar 2026
Target Date:	13 Feb 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Catherine Cardin</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Steven King</i>	Date:	19 Mar 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/3213

**90 Renfields, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 4TG, , ,
Rear Extension.
Mr And Mrs Ashley**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

No letters of representation have been received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Southern Water

No objection.

MSDC Flood risk and drainage

No objection.

TOWN COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No comment.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought for a single storey rear extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

04/02676/OUT- Outline application for residential development, based on a maximum ceiling limit of 573 units. (Amended proposals). Refused.

04/02681/OUT- Outline application for residential development, based on a maximum ceiling limit of 785 units. Appeal allowed.

04/02964/FUL- Full application for all highway and infrastructure works associated with the residential development of Phase 4 of Bolnore. Refused.

04/02965/FUL- Full application for all highway and infrastructure works associated with the residential development of Phases 4 and 5 of Bolnore. (Amended proposals including revised drawings and additional information). Appeal allowed.

05/00048/FUL- Full application for residential development consisting of 306 units, and all associated works. Withdrawn.

06/00247/OUT- Outline application for residential development, based on a maximum ceiling limit of 573 units. Withdrawn.

06/00248/FUL- Full application for all highway and infrastructure works associated with the residential development of Phase 4 of Bolnore Village. Withdrawn.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

90 Renfields is a semi-detached two storey dwelling which lies on the southeastern side of the main stretch of Renfields. The dwelling is characterised by red brick and a plain tile roof. The property benefits from off street parking to the front of the property to accommodate one car. The rear garden benefits from a rectangular rear garden with raised patio, where the boundary is enclosed by a 1.8m high close boarded fence.

The property lies within a modern housing development within the built-up area boundary of Haywards Heath. The locality comprises terraced two storey modern housing with a mix of brickwork, render and timber clad elevations. Neighbouring properties are located to the northeast and southwest. Highway is located to the northwest.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The application seeks planning permission for a single storey rear extension.

The extension would measure some 4.7 metres in width and some 2.9 metres in depth. This would have a pitched roof, with a maximum height of some 3.6 metres and a height to the eaves of some 2.7 meters. It is proposed to install sliding doors on the rear (southern) elevation, a door on the side (northeastern) elevation, and two no. rooflights.

The extension would be finished in brickwork and roof tiles to match the 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

DP41 - Flood risk and Drainage

Site Allocations DPD

The SADPD was adopted on 29th June 2022. It allocates sufficient housing and employment land to meet identified needs to 2031.

No relevant policies

Neighbourhood Plan

Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan was made in 2016.

Relevant policies:

E9 - Design

H9 - Extensions of Dwellings in Built-Up Areas

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 the stage 1 hearings were concluded on the 31st October 2024. There are unresolved objections to some of the

Policies in the draft District Plan and as such, 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

DPB1 - Character and Design

DPS4 - Flood Risk and Drainage

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

It is considered that the main issues that need to be considered in the determination of this application are as follows;

- Design and Impact on the Character of the Area
- Impact on Neighbouring Amenities
- Flood Risk and Drainage
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Design and Character

Policy DP26 of the District Plan relates to character and design and requires all proposals 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. In part the policy requires proposals to be of a high quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace; and creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape.

Policy E9 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan relates to design and contains a similar ethos.

Policy H9 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan relates to extensions and states that:

'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.*

The Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD also provides advice for extensions to dwellings. Principle DG49 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.'

Principle DG51 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD relates to rear extensions and states that:

'Rear extensions which are not visible from the street and do not negatively impact on neighbouring properties can be expressed in many forms, including by adopting a contemporary architectural approach. With reference to DG49, they should nevertheless have consideration for the character of the existing building and the relationship of the extension with the side boundaries and adjacent buildings and gardens.'

The proposed extension would be of a form and design which is acceptable and is considered to be in proportion and appropriate to the character of the existing dwelling. It is considered that the proposal appropriately considers the side boundaries and adjacent buildings and gardens. The proposal would be finished in external materials to match the existing which would provide a consistent finish. The proposed rear extension would not be visible from the street scene and, as such, it is not considered that there would be significant harm to the character of the area.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy DP26 of the District Plan, policies E9 and H9 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant principles of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.

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);'

Policy H9 in the Neighbourhood Plan refers to 'The privacy, daylight, sunlight and outlook of adjoining residents are safeguarded.'

As such there is some conflict between the two policies.

Under section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 if a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflict 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 District Plan is considered to take precedence and therefore the test in this instance is whether the development causes significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents.

To the southwest is 88 Renfields. As the proposal is modest and single storey, it is not considered that the development would cause significant harm to the light and outlook of this neighbour. No window is proposed on the side elevation so it is not considered that the proposal would give rise to significant overlooking concerns.

To the northeast is 92 Renfields. Given that this neighbour has an existing extension at the same depth of the proposal it is not considered that the proposal would cause significant harm to the light and outlook of this neighbour. A window is proposed in the side (northeastern) elevation. Given the existing 1.8 metre close board fence and the single storey nature of the proposal, it is not considered that the proposal would give rise to significant overlooking concerns.

To the southeast is 86 Renfields. As these neighbours would be offset from the development by some 7.5 metres, it is not considered that the proposal would be harmful to the light and outlook of this neighbour. Given the single storey nature of the proposal and the existing brick wall boundary treatments, it's not considered that the development would give rise to significant overlooking concerns.

Due to the domestic nature of the proposed development, it is considered that there would not be a harmful impact in terms of noise, air and light pollution.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would not cause harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore deemed to accord with the above part of policy DP26 of the District Plan.

Flood Risk and Drainage

Policy DP41 relates to flood risk and drainage and requires development to demonstrate it is safe across its lifetime and not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. It states in part that:

'Proposals for development will need to follow a sequential risk-based approach, ensure development is safe across its lifetime and not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. The District Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) should be used to identify areas at present and future flood risk from a

range of sources including fluvial (rivers and streams), surface water (pluvial), groundwater, infrastructure and reservoirs.

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 application site is at very low risk of fluvial flooding and at very low to medium risk of surface water flooding. MSDC Flood risk and drainage were consulted on the application and have provided a response. They have not raised an objection to the proposal. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with the relevant criteria policy DP41 of the District Plan.

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 proposal is considered to be appropriate in terms of design, size and scale to the dwellinghouse and locality, and would not cause harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties.

In conclusion, the proposal complies with Mid Sussex District Plan policies DP26 and DP41, policy E9 and H9 of the Haywards heath Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant provisions of the NPPF. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Catherine Cardin