

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/0751	Case Officer:	Deborah Lynn
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension.		
Site:	Field Cottage, Sloop Lane, Scaynes Hill, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 7NP, ,		
Validation Date	23 Mar 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	24 Apr 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	14 May 2026
Target Date:	18 May 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Deborah Lynn

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Steven King	Date:	15 May 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/0751

**Field Cottage, Sloop Lane, Scaynes Hill, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 7NP,
Single storey rear extension.
CO AGENT**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

MSDC Conservation Officer

The proposal is therefore considered to preserve the setting and special interest of the listed building, meeting the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Southern Water

If the developer is proposing to utilise the existing connection, Southern Water will have no objections to the proposed extension.

LINDFIELD RURAL PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

LRPC have no comment.

INTRODUCTION

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

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

06/02137/FUL - Demolition of existing two bedroom cottage and shed, and development of a replacement three bedroom dwelling. Permission granted 08.12.2006.

07/01066/FUL - Proposed garage. Permission granted 05.06.2007.

12/01717/FUL - Alterations to existing garage to raise roof height by 1 metre and convert loft to provide ancillary accommodation. Permission granted 13.07.2012.

DM/22/3074 - In breach of the Agricultural occupancy condition (No: 7) for a continuous period of over ten years. Permission granted 25.11.2022.

DM/23/0267 - Removal of planning condition no 7 relating to planning application LR/06/02137/FUL. Permission granted 21.03.2023.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Field Cottage is a modern, detached 1½ storey dwellinghouse with rooms in the roof space, located on the eastern side of Sloop Lane in Scaynes Hill.

The dwellinghouse is well set back from the road and accessed via a vehicular drive that also serves as a public footpath (reference 40LR). The property benefits from a 3 bay car port with storage above located to the front (west of the dwellinghouse) with a parking area for several cars. A generous sized garden lies to the rear, which is surrounded by fields.

To the north, on the opposite side of the public footpath, lies Bacon Wish, a grade II listed building.

In terms of planning policy, the property lies within the countryside.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Proposed plans show that a single storey extension is proposed to the rear (east) of the dwellinghouse. This is shown to project approximately 4 metres from the rear wall of the cottage and will measure 5 metres wide by 3.6 metres high with a crown roof proposed.

The extension will provide a dining room off the existing kitchen / dining area and will be finished with facing brickwork and a plain clay tiled roof, with white painted timber framed windows to match the existing cottage.

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:

DP12 protection and enhancement of countryside

DP26 character and design

DP34 listed buildings and other heritage assets

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 relevant policies.

Other Legislation

Planning (Listed Building 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:

DPS2 sustainable design and construction

DPS6 health and wellbeing

DPC1 protection and enhancement of the countryside

DPB1 character and design

DPB2 listed buildings and other heritage assets

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 is a material consideration. The following paragraphs are deemed relevant when considering this application:

202. Heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.

210. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

212. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

213. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.

214. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

215. 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.

219. Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal

their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.

ASSESSMENT

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

- Design and impact on character of area
- Impact on setting of the listed building

Design and impact on character of area

As the site lies within the countryside, NPPF paragraph 187 is relevant, stating in part that planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

This stance is reflected under policy DP12 of the District Plan which states that development proposals will be permitted in the countryside provided they maintain or where possible enhance the quality of the rural and landscape character of the District.

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 DG51 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.'*

DG51 relates specifically to rear extensions and states the following:

'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 is considered appropriate in terms of design, scale and form to the existing dwellinghouse and its setting and with complementary materials proposed, should not detract from the character and appearance of the cottage or its rural setting. Views of the extension should be relatively well screened from the adjoining public footpath by the established hedge that lines the northern boundary of the property with the PROW.

The proposal is not considered to impact neighbouring amenities due to the distance and intervening hedging and PROW between the application site and adjoining dwellinghouse at Bacon Wish.

As such the proposal is considered sympathetic to the character and appearance of the existing dwellinghouse and its setting and should not detract from the character and appearance of the rural area. The wider rural and landscape character of the District will be maintained. The proposal thereby accords with policies DP12 and DP26 of the District Plan.

Impact upon setting of the listed building

The application site adjoins a grade II listed building to the north at Bacon Wish, a 17th century cottage that has been much extended to the east.

As such, section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is relevant, stating that:

'In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.'

District Plan policy DP34 is relevant in this respect, stating in part that '*special regard is given to protecting the setting of a listed building*'.

The listing details for Bacon Wish are noted as follows:

"LINDFIELD RURAL SCAMP'S HILL 1. 5405 Bacon Wish TQ 32 SE 17/342 II

2. C17 cottage. Two storeys. Two windows. Faced with weather-boarding. Half-hipped tiled roof. Casement Windows.

Listing NGR: TQ3853624270"

The Council's Conservation Officer has been consulted regarding the proposal. Whilst no Heritage Statement has been submitted with the application (a local validation requirement) she advises that:

'The proposed extension is modest and scale appropriately subservient to the existing house. Given the intervening planted screening, the addition should be visible in only glimpsed views from Bacon Wish and its immediate setting, and should not appear unduly prominent from the PROW. Although the crown roof is not a traditional feature, I appreciate this is adopted to reduce the height of the addition so that the existing dormer window above is not obscured. On balance, given the modern date of the property, this is not considered contentious. In other respects, the lightweight design and sympathetic materials are appropriate for the context.'

The proposal is therefore considered to preserve the setting and special interest of the listed building, meeting the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.'

In view of these comments, the proposed development is deemed acceptable in that it will preserve the setting of the listed building in accordance with policy DP34 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 proposed extension is considered acceptable in terms of design, form and scale to the existing dwellinghouse and should not detract from its character and appearance or its rural setting. The wider rural and landscape character of the District will be maintained. The proposal should also preserve the setting of the adjoining listed building at Bacon Wish. The proposal therefore accords with policies DP12, DP26 and DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Deborah Lynn