

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/1391	Case Officer:	Catherine Cardin
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Full width rear extension and loft conversion		
Site:	51 Lewes Road, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 7SY, , , ,		
Validation Date	4 Jun 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	18 Sep 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	22 Sep 2026
Target Date:	30 Jul 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Catherine Cardin</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	23 Sep 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/1391

**51 Lewes Road, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 7SY, , ,
Full width rear extension and loft conversion
Mr Crofton**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

MSDC Conservation Officer

51 Lewes Road is an unlisted detached house located to the northern side of Lewes Road, within the Lewes Road Conservation Area. The house dates from the second half of the 20th century, and is in a loosely vernacular style, with a hipped tiled roof with prominent chimney stacks, over elevations which are part brick, part render and part hung tile. The property has 'Georgian' style upvc casement windows. The house is not of any particular architectural or historical interest, but is consistent in its style and materials with other properties to this part of Lewes Road, and broadly respectful of the semi-rural, edge of town context.

The current proposal is for alterations and extensions including a hip to gable roof extension to the western side, three new rooflights to the front roof slope, a single storey rear extension, addition of three dormers to the rear, and replacement windows, with some alterations to window openings. To consider these works in turn:

- The proposed side roof extension will result in an increase in bulk at roof level and will to an extent unbalance the massing of the building; however, the composition of the façade is not currently strictly symmetrical, and one would not necessarily expect this in a vernacular-style house. On balance, this aspect of the proposal is considered acceptable.
- The new rooflights are not considered contentious subject to detail.
- The proposed single storey rear addition, while fairly substantial in scale, remains subservient to the host dwelling and is not considered contentious in principle. I would also not object to the flat roofed form in this context. However, the detailed elevational treatment does not reflect the high quality of contextual design which we would expect to see in the context of a Conservation Area, even in a rearward position, and would benefit from reconsideration.
- While the addition of dormer windows to the rear is not considered contentious in principle, in my opinion the number and scale of the windows currently shown is excessive, and contrary to the requirements of the Council's adopted Design Guide at DG52 and 6.3.5. to 6.3.8. Dormers should be suitably sized and proportioned so that they are subservient to the roof. I would recommend that the number of dormers in this instance is reduced to two, and that these are reduced in size (height and width).
- The existing windows to the property are white uPVC. This is not a material which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and as such the proposal to replace the existing units with aluminium framed windows is not considered contentious in principle. However, although the proposal shows the existing Georgian style casements retained to the front elevation of the building, a change in colour to anthracite grey is proposed. Although I appreciate this is currently fashionable, it is not sympathetic to the 'traditional' character of the house or the wider Conservation Area context, and I would suggest that the colour is amended to white as existing. At the rear, a change to the style of the windows is also proposed, with some enlargement of openings at ground floor. Given the rearward position of these windows, I would not consider that an objection to this aspect of the proposal could be sustained.

In summary therefore, although the majority of the proposal is considered acceptable in principle, amendments are required to the design of the rear extension, the number and scale of the rear dormers, and the colour of the replacement windows. This is to ensure that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is preserved, meeting the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Further comments on the application:

The revisions show the number of dormers to the rear of the house reduced to two, and these reduced in width. This addresses the concerns previously raised in this respect. In addition, the proposed anthracite grey replacement windows have been substituted with white aluminium windows. Again, this addresses the concerns raised.

The proposal is therefore considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, meeting the requirements of the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF, including HE9, as well as District Plan Policy DP35.

I would recommend the following conditions:

- Details of roofing and facing materials
- Detailed drawings, at an appropriate large scale, including sections, and annotated to show materials and finishes, of the following:
 - typical examples of new windows and external doors; and
 - typical eaves detail (dormers and rear extension).
- Rainwater goods and other external pipework to be of painted metal.
- Rooflights to be flush fitting, metal framed, conservation style rooflights.

TOWN COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No comment.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for a single-storey rear extension, loft conversion incorporating rear dormers, replacement windows and doors, alterations to window openings and the installation of rooflights.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

01/00604/FUL- Single storey side extension to provide larger kitchen and rear conservatory. Permission.

05/01238/FUL- Demolition of existing detached garage and garden room and erection of ancillary annexe and garage. Permission.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application property is a two-storey detached dwelling. The property is characterised by cream coloured render at ground floor level, tile hanging at first floor level, red brick and plain roof tiles. The property benefits from a large, detached annexe located to its eastern side.

The application property lies within the built-up area boundary of Haywards Heath and lies within the Haywards Heath Lewes Road Conservation Area. Neighbouring properties are located to the east, west and north. Lewes Road lies to the south of the application site.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposed rear extension would measure approximately 10.6 metres in width and 4 metres in depth. This would incorporate a flat roof with a maximum height of approximately 2.9 metres. Two windows and a door are proposed on the rear (northwestern) elevation, whilst a further window is proposed on each of the side (southwestern and northeastern) elevations.

The application also seeks to construct two dormer windows on the rear (northwestern) roof pitch. These would measure approximately 1.6 metres in width and 1.9 metres in depth. The dormers would have a hipped roof form with a maximum height of approximately 1.7 metres and an eaves height of 1.2 metres. These would each incorporate a window on the rear (northwestern) elevation, with the northernmost dormer being obscure glazed.

It is also proposed to replace seven windows and a door on the front (southeastern) elevation, to install three rooflights on the front (southeastern) roof pitch, to replace three windows on the rear (northwestern) elevation at first floor level, and to replace two doors and a window on the side (northeastern) elevation at ground floor level.

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.

Relevant policies:

No relevant policies

Neighbourhood Plan

Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan was made in 2016.

Relevant policies:

Policy E9 - Promoting Good Design

Policy H9 - Extensions

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 is currently at Examination with initial hearings held in February/March 2026. The Council is consulting on Main Modifications which are required to ensure the plan is legally compliant and sound. 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

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) (August 2026)

ASSESSMENT

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

- Impact on character and appearance of the area and heritage assets
- Neighbouring Amenities
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Impact on character and appearance of the area and heritage assets

The site is located within the Haywards Heath Lewes Road Conservation Area, as designated in 1989. 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".

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 preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.'

Policy DP26 of the District Plan relates to character and design. Policy E9 and H9 of the Neighbourhood Plan have a similar ethos. However, these policies are considered to have very limited weight as they are materially inconsistent with the NPPF, and greater weight should be given to policy DP3 of the NPPF.

With regard to the Conservation Area, Policy DP35 of the District Plan seeks to conserve and enhance the special characteristics of the area. However, this policy is considered to have very limited weight as it is materially inconsistent with the NPPF, and greater weight should be given to policy HE9 of the NPPF.

Principle DG49 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide relates to general principles for extensions and requires that extensions should fit in with both the existing house and its surroundings, appearing as a subordinate addition rather than overwhelming or competing with the original building.

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

'rear extensions can be more modern or innovative in design, particularly when they are hidden from public view, but they should still relate well to the existing house, respect neighbouring properties, and avoid appearing disconnected from the original building.

Policy DP3 of the NPPF sets out the key principles for well-designed places. This sets out in part that proposals should respond to their context, so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings;

such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets.

Policy HE6 of the NPPF requires substantial weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets and requires any harm to be clearly justified and weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal.

Policy HE9 of the NPPF sets out that development proposals should *'retain and conserve buildings and other features which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area where possible.'*

The application site lies within the Haywards Heath Lewes Road Conservation Area.

The Conservation Officer was consulted and advised that the host dwelling makes a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area through its vernacular form, traditional materials and semi-rural setting. It is noted that the Conservation Officer's consultation response refers to a hip-to-gable roof extension to the western side of the dwelling. No hip-to-gable roof enlargement forms part of the submitted proposal and consequently this element of the consultation response has not been taken into account in the assessment of the proposal.

Initial concerns were raised regarding the scale and number of dormer windows, the proposed replacement fenestration and the treatment of the rear elevation. During the course of the application revised plans were submitted which reduced the scale and number of dormers, amended the proposed window colour to white and revised elements of the rear elevation design. Following these amendments, the Conservation Officer confirmed that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, subject to conditions.

The proposed rear extension would appear subordinate to the host dwelling by virtue of its scale, siting, footprint and relationship with the existing building. Whilst contemporary in design with a flat-roofed form, the extension would be largely concealed from public views within the Conservation Area and would remain clearly read as a secondary addition to the original dwelling. As such, it would not appear incongruous or detract from the character of the property or its surroundings.

The proposed rear dormer windows have been reduced in scale through the submission of amended plans and are considered appropriately proportioned within the roof slope. The dormers would remain subordinate features which would not dominate the roofscape or undermine the architectural character of the dwelling.

The replacement windows would largely retain the existing pattern and proportions of openings. Whilst some alterations to the fenestration arrangement are proposed, these would remain sympathetic to the architectural character of the dwelling and would not appear visually discordant. The use of white painted frames is considered appropriate within the context of the property and reflects the advice of the Conservation Officer.

Whilst the Conservation Officer has recommended a condition requiring painted metal rainwater goods, such a requirement is not considered necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. The existing dwelling already incorporates white uPVC rainwater goods, and the proposed works would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area without this additional restriction.

Having regard to the revised design, scale and appearance of the proposed works, it is considered that the development would preserve the character and appearance of the Haywards Heath Lewes Road Conservation Area. Accordingly, the proposal would satisfy the statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, result in no harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, and accord with Policies DP3, HE6 and HE9 of the NPPF, together with the relevant guidance contained within the Mid Sussex Design Guide.

Neighbouring Amenities

Policy DP26 in part seeks to ensure that new development does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings. Policy H9 of the Neighbourhood Plan requires that *the privacy, daylight, sunlight and outlook of adjoining residents are safeguarded*. However, these policies are considered to have very limited weight as they are materially inconsistent with the NPPF. Accordingly, greater weight is afforded to Policies L2 and P3 of the NPPF.

Policy L2 of the NPPF relates to making effective use of land. Part L2(1dii) requires proposals to maintain *'acceptable living standards for residents and neighbours in terms of access to daylight, sunlight, privacy and external amenity space'*.

Policy P3 of the NPPF relates to living conditions and pollution. Part 2(b) of this policy requires proposals *'Not give rise to, or contribute to, an unacceptable level of access to daylight and sunlight for neighbouring residents and occupiers, or unacceptable levels of air, noise, artificial light, water, soil or other forms of pollution on or beyond the site'*.

To the southwest of the application site lies 49 Lewes Road. Given the separation distance between the properties, the orientation of the dwellings and the single-storey nature of the extension, it is not considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the light and outlook of this neighbouring property. Two dormer windows are proposed on the rear (northwestern) elevation. Given the orientation and arrangement of the properties, the dormers would principally afford oblique views towards limited parts of the neighbouring rear garden and would not result in direct overlooking of principal habitable room windows. The proposed dormer serving the shower room would be obscure glazed. As such, it is not considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the privacy of the occupiers of 49 Lewes Road. A window is proposed on the side elevation (southwestern) at ground floor level. Given the existing boundary treatments, it is not considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the privacy of this neighbouring property.

To the northeast of the application site lies 53 Lewes Road. Given the separation distance between the properties, the orientation of the dwellings and the single-storey nature of the extension, it is not considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the light and outlook of this neighbouring property. Two dormer windows are proposed on the rear (northwestern) elevation. Given that the dwellings are angled away from one another, together with the presence of the existing two-storey annexe between them, the dormers would principally afford oblique views towards limited sections of the neighbouring rear garden and would not result in direct overlooking of principal habitable room windows. The proposed dormer serving the shower room would be obscure glazed. As such, it is not considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the privacy of the occupiers of 53 Lewes Road.

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.

The proposal is therefore considered to have an acceptable impact on neighbouring residential amenity and accords with the objectives of Policy DP26 of the District Plan and Policies L2 and P3 of the NPPF.

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 development is considered acceptable in terms of its scale, design and appearance and would preserve the character and appearance of the Haywards Heath Lewes Road Conservation Area. Furthermore, the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on neighbouring residential amenity. The proposal is therefore considered to accord with Policies DP26 and DP35 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policies E9 and H9 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan, the Mid Sussex Design

Guide SPD and Policies DP3, L2, P3, HE6 and HE9 of the NPPF. Accordingly, planning permission is recommended for approval.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Catherine Cardin