

PLANNING, DESIGN & HERITAGE STATEMENT



55 LEWES ROAD



SEPTEMBER 2025

V-1

55 LEWES ROAD

PLANNING, DESIGN & HERITAGE STATEMENT

Project Ref: 45407.MP

Client: Mr M Philips



Schiehallion, London Road

Stroud, GL5 1DR

07578 462751

01453 700458

contactus@acreplanning.co.uk

www.acreplanning.co.uk

Contents

1.0	INTRODUCTION:	1
2.0	SITE ASSESSMENT:	2
2.1	Location	2
2.2	Site	2
2.3	Planning History	3
3.0	POLICY & GUIDANCE REVIEW:	4
3.1	Local	4
3.2	Principle of Development	4
4.0	PROPOSAL:	6
4.1	Development Details	6
4.2	Layout	6
4.3	Scale	6
4.4	Design & Appearance	6
4.5	Access	6
4.6	Amenity	6
4.7	Flood Risk & Drainage	7
4.8	Heritage	7
4.9	Landscaping	9
5.0	CONCLUSION:	10

Appendix 1 Site Images

1.0 INTRODUCTION:

- 1.1 Acre Planning Limited has prepared this Planning, Design & Heritage Statement on behalf of Mr M Philips (hereafter '*the Applicant*') to support a Householder Planning Application relating to 55 Lewes Road, Haywards Heath (hereafter '*the site*').
- 1.2 This application seeks planning permission for the following development as described on the relevant planning forms:

'Erection of an outbuilding for use as a home office and games room.'
- 1.3 The purpose of this statement is to describe the site and the proposed development before establishing how the development proposal complies with the adopted Development Plan.
- 1.4 The structure of this Planning Statement is as follows:

2.0 Site Assessment - Describes the site and its surroundings and reviews the planning history for the site.

3.0 Policy & Guidance Review - Sets out the local planning policy and guidance context.

4.0 Proposal - Describes in detail the proposed development and provides an assessment/justification regarding planning policy and material considerations.

5.0 Conclusion

2.0 SITE ASSESSMENT:

2.1 Location

- 2.1.1 The site is on a residential street known as Lewes Road within the settlement of Haywards Heath. **Figure 1** illustrates the site's position. The site is within the Lewes Road Conservation Area.



Figure 1: Site Location

2.2 Site

- 2.2.1 The land within the red line, as set out on the accompanying site location plan, consists of the residential curtilage associated with 55 Lewes Road.
- 2.2.2 The existing property is a detached dwelling with a large garden to the south. The property lies adjacent to other dwellings to the south, east and west. The public highway is to the north of the dwelling.
- 2.2.3 The garden includes a lawn with a mix of planting, e.g shrubs and bamboo around the site boundaries. At the southern end of the garden is a small area of patio slabs located behind an above-ground trampoline.
- 2.2.4 Photographs of the application site are included in **Appendix 1**.

2.3 Planning History

2.3.1 Recent and relevant planning history concerning the site includes the following:

- 14/01057/FUL - Removal of existing balcony and the raising of the parapet wall height to an existing rear extension, erection of a single-storey extension to the rear in line with the existing extension, together with the installation of entrance gates to the front of the property. Approved 09/05/20214.

3.0 POLICY & GUIDANCE REVIEW:

- 3.0.1 This section identifies the relevant planning policies within the Development Plan for North Mid Sussex District Council, in line with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004).
- 3.0.2 In this case, the Local Development Plan consists of the District Plan and a Site Allocations Development Plan Document.
- 3.0.3 Furthermore, material considerations relevant to the proposed development, including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and accompanying Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) are also applicable to the proposal.
- 3.0.4 Local planning policies and guidance are now reviewed to ascertain their relevance to the location of the site and the development proposal.

3.1 Local

- 3.1.1 The adopted Development Plan is deemed to be generally consistent with the provisions of the NPPF, with the following policies being of relevance to this application:

District Plan:

- DP21 Transport
- DP26 Character and design
- *DP35: Conservation Areas*

Supplementary Planning Document

- Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD

3.2 Principle of Development

- 3.2.1 The development of an outbuilding within the curtilage of an established dwelling is generally acceptable in planning terms. In many cases, the provision of such a structure would be permitted development under The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). However, planning permission is required for the building to be within 2m of a boundary and over 2.5m in height.
- 3.2.2 In this case, the building would provide an outbuilding for use as a games room and home office. This would be an ancillary use to the main dwellinghouse. As such, the proposed use is considered acceptable regarding planning policy.
- 3.2.3 The proposal is considered suitable in principle; however, other policy considerations must be addressed, such as heritage impacts, design and local amenity. These matters are

considered within section 4.0 of this statement regarding applicable local planning policies and guidance as referred to above.

4.0 PROPOSAL:

4.1 Development Details

- 4.1.1 The development proposal includes the erection of a detached outbuilding to be used as a games room and home office.
- 4.1.2 The key elements of the proposal are now considered:

4.2 Layout

- 4.2.1 The proposed outbuilding would be situated in the south-western corner of the site. The cabin's positioning will ensure sufficient private amenity space is retained.

4.3 Scale

- 4.3.1 The outbuilding is suitably scaled with regard to the nature of the dwellinghouse, its curtilage, and adjacent structures. Therefore, it would not be overbearing concerning the adjacent dwellings or host property.

4.4 Design & Appearance

- 4.4.1 The elevations of the outbuilding would be finished with timber with shingles to be used on the roof.
- 4.4.2 It is considered that the proposed outbuilding, in terms of its scale and design, would be in keeping with its surroundings and would not harm the character and appearance of the area.

4.5 Access

- 4.5.1 Access from the highway is unchanged, and parking will not be altered.

4.6 Amenity

- 4.6.1 The proposal would not lead to overlooking, and it would not be overbearing with regard to adjacent dwellings. Using the building as a games room and home office will not lead to amenity issues such as noise.

4.7 Flood Risk & Drainage

- 4.7.1 The site is covered by Flood Zone 1 and, therefore, is not at risk of flooding. However, the building will have its finished floor level raised above the ground by 150mm with a water butt proposed for surface water drainage in addition to a soakaway.

4.8 Heritage

- 4.8.1 The Conservation Area setting has been a key consideration concerning the design and the siting of the proposal. The simple approach and the use of materials, particularly timber, will ensure that the hierarchy of the built form is maintained.
- 4.8.2 The Lewes Road Conservation Area is the key heritage asset to be assessed. The significance of the Conservation Area as a heritage asset must be evaluated as a requirement of the NPPF. The importance of identified cultural heritage resources is determined by reference to existing designations as set out in **Table 1**. The Conservation Area is considered to have a 'regional level' of significance.

Table 1: Assessing the Importance of a Cultural Heritage Site

SCALE OF SITE IMPORTANCE	
NATIONAL	The highest status of site, e.g. Scheduled Monuments (or undesignated assets of schedulable quality and importance). Grade I and Grade II* Listed Buildings. Other listed buildings that can be shown to have exceptional qualities in their fabric or historical associations not adequately reflected in the listing grade. Conservation Areas containing very important buildings. Undesignated structures of clear national importance. Extremely well preserved historic landscape, whether inscribed or not, with exceptional coherence, time depth, or other critical factor(s).
REGIONAL	Grade II Listed Buildings or other designated or undesignated archaeological sites (in addition to those listed above), or assets of a reasonably defined extent and significance, or reasonable evidence of occupation / settlement, ritual, industrial activity etc. Examples may include areas containing buildings that contribute significantly to its historic character, burial sites, deserted medieval villages, Roman roads and dense scatter of finds.
LOCAL	Evidence of human activity more limited in historic value than the examples above, or compromised by poor preservation and/or survival of context associations, though which still have the potential to contribute to local research objectives. Examples include sites such as 'locally designated' buildings or undesignated structures / buildings of limited historic merit, out-of-situ archaeological findspots / ephemeral archaeological evidence and historic field systems and boundaries etc.
NEGLIGIBLE	Assets with very little or no surviving archaeological interest. Examples include destroyed antiquities, structures of almost no architectural / historic merit, buildings of an intrusive character or relatively modern / common landscape features such as quarries, drains and ponds etc.
UNKNOWN	Insufficient information exists to assess the importance of a feature (e.g. unidentified features on aerial photographs).

- 4.8.3 The magnitude of impact upon the archaeological and heritage resource, which can be considered in terms of direct and indirect impacts, is determined by identifying the level of

effect from the proposed development upon the baseline conditions of the site and the cultural heritage resource identified. The criteria for assessing the magnitude of impact are set out in **Table 2**.

- 4.8.4 Localised planting would provide screening, and the scheme would be located near other nearby structures.
- 4.8.5 In terms of **Table 2**, it is considered that the scheme as proposed would have a 'low' magnitude of impact on the setting and assets.
- 4.8.6 The overall Significance of Effects from the proposed development upon the Cultural Heritage Resource is determined by correlating the magnitude of impact against the value of the cultural heritage resource. **Table 3** highlights the criteria for assessing the overall significance of the effects.

Table 2: Criteria for Determining the Magnitude of Impact

IMPACT LEVEL	DEFINITION
HIGH	Changes to most or all of the key archaeological or key heritage baseline elements, or comprehensive changes to the setting of such key features that lead to total or almost complete alteration of a features physical structure, dramatic visual alteration to the setting of a heritage asset, or almost comprehensive variation to aspects such as noise, access, or visual amenity of the historic landscape.
MEDIUM	Changes to many key archaeological materials/historic elements, or their setting, such that the baseline resource is clearly modified. This includes considerable visual change to many key aspects of the historic landscape, noticeable differences in noise or sound quality, and considerable changes to use or access changes to key historic landscape elements
LOW	Detectable impacts which alter the baseline condition of an archaeological or heritage receptor to a slight degree – e.g. a small proportion of the surviving heritage resource is altered; slight alterations to the setting or structure, or limited changes to aspects such as noise levels, use or access that results in limited changes to historic landscape character.
NEGLIGIBLE	Barely distinguishable change from baseline conditions, where there would be very little appreciable effect on a known site, possibly because of distance from the development, method of construction or landscape or ecological planting, that are thought to have no long term effect on the historic value of a resource.
UNCERTAIN	Extent / nature of the resource is unknown and the magnitude of change cannot be ascertained.

IMPORTANCE	MAGNITUDE			
	HIGH	MED	LOW	NEG
NATIONAL	Severe	Major	Mod	Minor
REGIONAL	Major	Mod	Minor	Not Sig.
LOCAL	Mod	Minor	Minor	Not Sig.
NEGLIGIBLE	Minor	Not Sig.	Not Sig.	Nt.

Not Sig. = Not Significant; Nt. = Neutral; Mod = Moderate; Ext. = Extensive

Table 3: Significance of Effects

- 4.8.7 The proposal can be seen to have a 'minor' impact upon the significance of the defined assets.
- 4.8.8 There is a delicate balance; however, it is considered that the scheme would be appropriate concerning the provisions of the NPPF, given that the scheme would preserve the asset and would not be detrimental to the setting.

4.9 Landscaping

- 4.9.1 The existing planted margins between the lawn and the boundary fencing will be reduced in depth. These margins consist of low shrubs that need the lawn area, along with bamboo that has taken over the area. The works would retain approximately 1m of screening to each boundary.

5.0 CONCLUSION:

- 5.1 This application has been prepared to demonstrate that the proposed outbuilding would be acceptable in planning terms.
- 5.2 The proposal takes full account of all relevant planning policies and guidance at both national and local levels.
- 5.3 It has been demonstrated that the proposal would be sympathetic to the local area and that the proposed development can come forward with little or no harm expected with regard to neighbouring amenity, the Conservation Area or the wider setting.









contactus@acreplanning.co.uk www.acreplanning.co.uk