

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/0243	Case Officer:	Catherine Cardin
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed two-storey rear extension and internal layout refurbishment, front extension, new garage, alterations to fenestration and new patio.		
Site:	70 Lewes Road, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 7SX, , , ,		
Validation Date	6 Feb 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	5 Jun 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Refusal	Recommendation Date:	11 Jun 2026
Target Date:	3 Apr 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:	11 Jun 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/0243

**70 Lewes Road, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 7SX, , ,
Proposed two-storey rear extension and internal layout refurbishment, front extension, new
garage, alterations to fenestration and new patio.
Mr Jack Martin**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Southern Water

No objection.

Conservation Officer

Original comments:

The application site is a semi-detached house located to the southern side of Lewes Road within the Lewes Road Conservation Area. The house pair, which date from the second half of the 20th century, are in a loosely vernacular style, with brick elevations, concrete tiled roofs, and casement windows. They are not of any particular architectural merit, and make a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, although the extensive gardens within which they are set do contribute positively to its spacious and verdant nature. Both houses appear to have been altered and extended; from historic map regression it would appear that they were not designed as a handed pair, although there is some consistency across the front elevations in terms of materials and fenestration. No. 70 has a detached garage set to the western side of the house.

The current proposal is for alterations and extensions including single storey additions to the front elevation, part two-part one storey extensions to the rear, and replacement windows. The proposal also includes replacement of the garage building.

To the front of the building, the proposal is for single storey lean to additions to provide a single unified element across the western part of the elevation. This is a relatively minor alteration to the scale and appearance of the building, and is considered acceptable subject to detail. At the rear, substantial part two, part one storey extensions are proposed comprising twin two storey gables flanking a single storey glazed 'garden room' addition. In other circumstances, the scale and bulk of these rear additions would be likely to be regarded as contentious, and contrary to the requirements of the Council's adopted Design Guide. However, in this instance the disjointed appearance of the existing rear elevation, and the rather overbearing bulk of the existing rear wing to the attached neighbour are such that it is not considered that an objection on design or Conservation Area grounds to the principle of the current proposal would be reasonable. However, I note the application form suggests the use of painted render to the elevations of the rear additions and would suggest this is amended to brickwork to match the existing. Hung tile at first floor may also be an option, but in my opinion the white painted render would exacerbate the apparent scale of the additions and would not relate well to the context.

The proposal includes replacement windows to the house. To the front elevation the existing multi-pane Georgian style casement windows, which are broadly consistent with the fenestration of the attached neighbour, are shown replaced with large pane uPVC windows. The application form states that the existing windows are 'mostly uPVC', but unless it is the case that the majority of the existing windows to the façade of the building are uPVC we would not accept them in this location, nor would I advise that the design of the windows is altered to large panes which would not be consistent with the windows to

no. 72. This aspect of the scheme requires further consideration. In general, we would not support uPVC windows within a Conservation Area, even to the sides and rear of a property, unless they are replacing existing uPVC windows, so it may be helpful for the applicant to provide further, more detailed information in this respect.

The proposed extended patio is not considered contentious subject to details of material.

It is proposed to demolish and replace the existing garage building on an enlarged footprint, with the additional bulk sitting to the rear. In the context of the extensive gardens to the property, this increase in scale is not considered contentious in principle. The design of the enlarged building appears similar to the existing, subject to details of materials which could be reserved by condition, and is also not considered contentious.

In summary although the principle of the proposal is considered on balance acceptable, aspects require reconsideration and amendment, namely the materials to the rear extensions and the detail of the proposed replacement windows (materials and design), particularly to the façade. This is to ensure that the proposal will preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, meeting the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35.

Further comments:

The application appears to have been amended to show the entire property rendered, and the windows replaced throughout with uPVC. Neither of these amendments address the concerns previously raised - the existing house is largely brickwork as is the attached neighbour, and as such rendering the building will be detrimental to the consistency of the semi-detached pair. The introduction of uPVC windows will, as noted before, not usually be considered acceptable in the context of the Conservation Area, and it would appear that no further justification has been submitted in this respect.

As it stands, therefore, the proposal would be considered harmful to the character and appearance of the Lewes Road Conservation Area, contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35. In terms of the NPPF, the proposal would result in less than substantial harm, at the lower end of that scale, such that the balancing exercise set out in paragraph 215 will apply.

TOWN COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No comment.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey rear extension, front extension, new garage, alterations to fenestration and new patio.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

06/00382/FUL- New double detached garage to replace existing single. Permission.

13/00654/FUL- Proposed extensions to rear (detached garage element of scheme withdrawn 16th April 2012). Permission.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

70 Lewes Road is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. The property is characterised by red brick, white timber and uPVC fenestration and a pantile roof. The property benefits from an existing detached garage and an area of off-street parking to the front of the property to accommodate approximately three cars.

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

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposal seeks planning permission for the erection of a part two-storey, part-single storey rear extension, a front infill extension, a detached garage, and associated alterations.

The two-storey rear extension would comprise two projecting elements with a flat roof single-storey section positioned between them. The western projection would measure approximately 4.5 metres in width and 5 metres in depth, with a pitched roof reaching a ridge height of approximately 6.9 metres and an eaves height of approximately 5.3 metres. The eastern projection would measure approximately 4.1 metres in width and 5 metres in depth, also featuring a pitched roof with a ridge height of approximately 6.9 metres. Two windows are proposed on the rear (southern) elevation at first-floor level, serving two bedrooms.

The single storey element would span approximately 15.9 metres in width and 5 metres in depth, with a flat roof reaching a maximum height of approximately 2.8 metres. The rear (southern) elevation would include two windows and bi-fold doors at ground level, serving a kitchen/ dining area.

The front infill extension would measure approximately 4 metres in width and 1.2 metres in depth, with a pitched roof reaching a maximum height of approximately 3.6 metres and an eaves height of 2.6 metres. This would provide a new entrance.

The proposal also includes the demolition of the existing detached garage and construction of a single-storey detached garage measuring approximately 5 metres in width and 9.4 metres in depth. The garage would have a pitched roof with a ridge height of approximately 3.8 metres and an eaves height of 2.5 metres. It would feature a double garage door on the front (northern) elevation, a window and door on the side (eastern) elevation and a single door on the rear (southern) elevation.

In addition, seven uPVC windows are proposed on the front (northern) elevation, with two uPVC windows and a door proposed on the side (western) elevation of the dwelling.

Finally, the proposal includes the rendering of the entire property.

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.

No relevant policies

Neighbourhood Plan

Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan was made in 2016.

Relevant policies:
Policy E9 - Promoting Good Design
Policy H9 - Extensions

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:
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) (December 2024)

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 DP35 of the District Plan in part states that:

'Development will also protect the setting of the conservation area and in particular views into and out of the area. New buildings of outstanding or innovative design may be acceptable in conservation areas provided that their impact would not cause material harm to the area.'

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 H9 of the Neighbourhood Plan contains a similar ethos.

Policy E9 of the Neighbourhood Plan states 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.'

Principle DG49 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide relates to general principles for extensions and 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 DG50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide relates to front extensions and states that:

'Where front extensions are considered acceptable, they should normally be limited to a modest single storey or porch-type extension that reflect the character of the existing property.'

Principle DG51 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide 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.'

Paragraphs 212 - 215 of the NPPF state:

'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.'

The proposed rear extension is considered to be of an appropriate scale and design to the existing property. The hipped roofs of the two-storey element respond positively to the character of the existing building and the proposed arrangement is considered an improvement on the existing. As the rear extension would not be visible from the street scene, it is not considered that this aspect of the proposal would be harmful to the character of the area.

The proposed front extension is also considered to be an appropriate scale and design. The pitched roof responds positively to the character of the host dwelling. While the proposed garage would have a larger footprint than the existing, it is nevertheless considered to be of an appropriate scale and design, with its pitched roof reflecting the character of the host dwelling.

Concerns were raised regarding the proposed windows to the front elevation. During the course of the application, revised plans were submitted which proposed to render the entire property and replace all windows with uPVC. The Conservation Officer was consulted on the application and has advised that rendering the building would be detrimental to the consistency of the semi-detached pair, and that the introduction of uPVC windows has not been adequately justified. The Conservation Officer has identified harm to the Conservation Area at the lower end of "less than substantial harm". This conclusion is agreed by the Case Officer.

Where harm is considered less than substantial, paragraph 215 of the NPPF applies. This requires that such harm be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. This balancing exercise must be undertaken by the decision-maker, giving great weight to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the Conservation Area.

The proposal relates to a householder and would deliver no public benefits beyond the private domestic gain.

Overall, it is considered that the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area, which would not be sufficiently outweighed by public benefits arising from the proposal. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies DP26 and DP35 of the District Plan, Policies E9 and H9 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan, Paragraph 215 of the NPPF and Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Neighbouring Amenities

In terms of impact on neighbouring amenities, Policy DP26 of the District Plan states proposals should *'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'*.

To the eastern side of the site is 72 Lewes Road. Whilst there may be some limited impact on light and outlook, this is not considered to amount to material harm to the light and outlook of this neighbouring property. Given that this neighbour has a two-storey extension at a similar depth to the proposal and that the proposed hipped roof would slope away from these neighbours, it is not considered that the development would materially affect the light and outlook of this neighbour. Whilst the proposal would see an increase in the built form towards this neighbour and include new rear-facing windows, these openings would offer only oblique views toward the garden of no.72 and would be partially screened by the single storey extension along the shared boundary. As such, they are not considered to result in a level of overlooking that would materially harm residential amenity.

To the western side of the site is 68 Lewes Road. Given that this neighbour would be offset from the development by some 27 metres and would be angled away from the proposal it is not considered that the development would be harmful to the light and outlook of this neighbour. As no windows are proposed on the side elevation it is not considered that the proposal 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.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy DP26 of the District Plan in respect of its impact on neighbouring amenity, and the relevant principles of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.

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, by reason of the extensive rendering of the existing dwelling and the replacement of traditional timber windows with uPVC windows on the front elevation, would result in harmful and incongruous alteration to the external appearance of the property. These changes would erode the established character and appearance of the semi-detached pair and fail to preserve or enhance the wider Haywards Heath Lewes Road Conservation Area, within which the site is located.

The identified harm is considered to amount to "less than substantial harm" to the significance of the designated heritage asset, at the lower end of the scale. In accordance with paragraph 215 of the NPPF, this harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The development would deliver no public benefits beyond private domestic gain, which attracts very limited weight and is insufficient to outweigh the identified harm.

Furthermore, the harmful elements form an integral part of the scheme as submitted and cannot be adequately mitigated through the use of planning conditions.

The proposal therefore fails 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, the relevant provisions of the NPPF, and the statutory duty set out in section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Decision: Refusal

Case Officer: Catherine Cardin