

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 19 August 2025 15:35:37 UTC+01:00
To: "Rachel Richardson" <Rachel.Richardson@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: DM/25/0432 68 Sydney Road, HH

Hi Rachel

Further comments on the above application following the receipt of revised plans. Please read these in conjunction with my previous comments, below.

The proposal has been revised to reduce somewhat the width of the proposed side extension, and to change the roof form to partly hipped roof, with a crown roof to the rear, and flat roof above the single storey rear extension.

As previously stated, the principle of enlarging the side extension remains in my opinion contentious. Although the width of the addition has been reduced, the increase in depth and consequently reduced set back from the front elevation remains as previously proposed, and in my opinion this continues to result in an addition which will adversely affect the characteristic symmetry of the villa pair. A crown roof is still included, and the fenestration remains in part unsympathetic to the host building.

In my opinion the proposal therefore continues to detract from the character and appearance of the Heath Conservation Area, contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35. In terms of the NPPF the proposal causes less than substantial harm, such that paragraph 215 will apply.

Thanks,

Emily

Please note that this advice is given at Officer level only and is without prejudice to the formal decision of the District Council.

Submit your planning application online.
<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk>

Emily Wade Ma MSc
Conservation Officer
Planning Services
Tel: +44 (0)1444 477385
emily.wade@midsussex.gov.uk <http://www.midsussex.gov.uk>



From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>

Sent: 02 June 2025 10:49

To: Rachel Richardson <Rachel.Richardson@midsussex.gov.uk>

Subject: DM/25/0432 68 Sydney Road, HH

Hi Rachel

Comments on the above planning application. My apologies for the delay in getting these to you, which has been caused by pressure of other work and a period of leave.

The application site is one half of a handed pair of semi-detached houses located to the southern side of Sydney Road within the Heath Conservation Area.

The house pair, which appear to date from the late 19th century, are one of a run of villa pairs of a similar date along this side of Sydney Road- those further to the west back directly onto the open space of the Heath. This pair and the adjoining houses at 72-74 Sydney Road are similar in style, having hipped, originally slate, roofs with central chimney stacks, brick elevations, projecting canted bay windows to the ground floor frontage, and sash windows (some replaced). The house pairs further to the west are a mixture of rendered and brick properties, again handed, and although with some variation in form and design are of a similar period and share stylistic similarities including features typical of their period such as symmetry, projecting bays and sash windows. As such the houses have group value, and make a strong positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

No. 68 Sydney Road has particular group value with its attached neighbour (no. 70), and with the almost identical adjacent pair at 72-74 Sydney Road.

The house has been previously extended to the side and rear over two storeys by a permission predating the creation of the Conservation Area. There are also further single storey rear additions including a conservatory. The current proposal, which follows on from refusal of a similar scheme, is for alterations and extensions comprising bringing forward the line of the existing two storey side addition, which is currently set well back, extending this addition also to the side, and replacement of the existing single storey rear additions with a single extension on a similar footprint.

The previous proposal was refused on grounds of the impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, due to the excessive and overbearing bulk of the proposed extensions, in particular their width and depth, and to their unsympathetic detailed design.

The current application has been revised in terms of the width of the side extension, which has been slightly reduced, and its height, which has also been set down by reducing the ridge height of the proposed crown roof. The detailed design has also been amended in terms of revisions to the fenestration pattern to the side and rear, and of the roof form to the replacement rear addition which is now shown as another crown roof.

In my opinion, these amendments do not successfully address the concerns raised in terms of the refused scheme. Although there is some reduction in bulk, the depth of the side addition has not been revised, and the addition remains overbearing and unduly prominent:

- the principle of enlarging the existing extension to the side of the building remains contentious in terms of its relationship with the host building and the impact on the symmetry of the villa pair. The greater width and depth of the extension as proposed will result in an overbearing relationship with the original house, particularly when viewed in conjunction with the existing additions to it, and the much reduced set back from the front elevation will render the extension significantly more prominent in views from Sydney Road, which will adversely affect the surviving symmetry of the pair.
- Furthermore, the form and design of the side extension as shown is not sympathetic to the original house. The proposed crown roof does not relate well to the characteristic hipped roof of the host building; the reduction in height, which has been achieved by reducing the height of the roof structure rather than of the elevations of the addition, has unfortunately resulted in an even less satisfactory appearance in this respect, as the addition now appears unbalanced.
- Aspects of the fenestration also remain unsympathetic, particularly to the side elevation.
- The proposed replacement rear extension remains acceptable in principle, but as previously noted the detailed design is not sympathetic and now includes a further crown roof.

In summary the proposal is considered to detract from the character and appearance of the house, the villa pair of which it is part, and the wider Conservation Area. This will not meet the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35. In terms of the NPPF, the proposal will result in less than substantial harm to the heritage asset, such that paragraph 215 will apply.

Thanks,

Emily

Please note that this advice is given at Officer level only and is without prejudice to the formal decision of the District Council.

Submit your planning application online.
<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk>

Emily Wade Ma MSc
Conservation Officer
Planning Services
Tel: +44 (0)1444 477385
emily.wade@midsussex.gov.uk <http://www.midsussex.gov.uk>

The
Electoral
Commission

You now need
photo ID to
vote at a
polling station

No ID? You can apply for free voter ID

Find out more at

electoralcommission.org.uk/voterID

or call 0800 328 0280