

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/2323	Case Officer:	Caroline Grist
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed single storey rear extension, single storey side extension, first floor rear extension and garage conversion, widening driveway, together with associated internal and external alterations		
Site:	5 William Allen Lane, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2SA, , ,		
Validation Date	16 Sep 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	7 Oct 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	5 Nov 2025
Target Date:	11 Nov 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Caroline Grist</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Steven King</i>	Date:	6 Nov 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/2323

**5 William Allen Lane, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2SA, ,
Proposed single storey rear extension, single storey side extension, first floor rear extension and
garage conversion, widening driveway, together with associated internal and external alterations
Mr And Mrs Golding**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

No representations have been received in response to this application.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Southern Water

The development site is not located within Southern Water's statutory area for water supply services. Please contact South East Water who are the relevant statutory undertaker.

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

Highways Authority

This application seeks the erection of various extensions, conversion of garage, widening of driveway and associated internal and external alterations. The site is located on William Allen Lane, an unclassified road subject to a speed restriction of 30 mph.

The existing dropped kerb is to be widened to facilitate access to a widened driveway. The proposed access works will be subject to a licence obtained from WSCC, and constructed to a specification agreed with a WSCC Highway Area Engineer.

From inspection of the plans, the widened driveway can accommodate two off-street car parking spaces, which would be considered suitable parking provision for a dwelling of this size. An external store will be retained from the proposed garage conversion, which can be utilised for cycle storage.

In summary, the LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 116), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

LRPC has no comment.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought for a single storey rear extension, single storey side extension, first floor rear extension and garage conversion, widening driveway, together with associated internal and external alterations.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

05/00550/FUL - Loft conversion with rear dormer. Permission.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

5 William Allen Lane is a south facing, detached, chalet bungalow. It is constructed of red brick, with the side and rear elevations finished in pebbledash, with a plain tile roof and upvc windows. The dwelling is characterised by a central eyebrow dormer window to the front and the roof overhangs to create an open porch. The dwelling also benefits from a flat roof, detached, garage to the side as well as a pitched roof, dormer window and conservatory to the rear.

The site is located within the built up area of Lindfield. Along the rear boundary of the property is a public footpath. Neighbouring dwellings are situated to the north, east and south of the site, whilst the highway is to the west. The dwelling is set back from the highway by a garden and driveway.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Planning permission is firstly sought to construct extensions to the dwelling to the rear of the house. Both ground floor and first floor additions are proposed, which would replace the existing dormer window and conservatory. The ground floor addition would contain the kitchen and dining area, whilst the first floor would allow for a bedroom to be enlarged and two en-suite bathrooms to be added.

The ground floor extension is to be some 3.5 metres deep and would span the rear elevation, some 8.8 metres. A crown pitched roof is proposed that would continue the existing eaves line and would have an overall height of approximately 4.0 metres. It is proposed to finish the walls of the extension in render and roof in tiles to match the existing.

The first floor extension would be some 2.0 metres deep and 7.5 metres wide. It is also to have a crown roof and would connect to the pitched roof of the ground floor extension. The eaves would sit approximately 1.4 metres above the single storey rear extension and the ridge would sit 0.2 metres below the ridge line of the existing house. This addition is to be finished in tile hanging and roof tiles to match the host dwelling.

A side extension is also proposed that would replace the current garage with an external store and utility room. A boot room would connect this to the main dwelling. Overall it is to be some 0.7 metres deeper than the existing building and up to 0.9 metres taller. A dummy pitch is proposed over the front section. The side and rear elevations are to be finished in render. It is also proposed to widen the existing driveway.

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 Allocations 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:

DP21 - Transport

DP26 - Character and Design

Site Allocations Development Plan Document

The Site Allocations DPD 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 Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan was made in March 2016.

There are no relevant policies.

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 the stage 1 hearings were concluded on the 31st October 2024. There are unresolved objections to some of the Policies in the draft District Plan and as such, 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

DPB1 - Character and Design

DPT1 - Placemaking and Connectivity

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

Design and impact on the character of the area

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan relates to design and states:

'All development and surrounding spaces, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings and replacement dwellings, will be well designed and reflect the distinctive character of the towns and villages while being sensitive to the countryside. All applicants will be required to demonstrate that development:

- o is of high quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace;*
- o contributes positively to, and clearly defines, public and private realms and should normally be designed with active building frontages facing streets and public open spaces to animate and provide natural surveillance;*
- o creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape;*
- o protects open spaces, trees and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;*

- o protects valued townscapes and the separate identity and character of towns and villages;
- o does 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 (see Policy DP27);
- o creates a pedestrian-friendly layout that is safe, well connected, legible and accessible;
- o incorporates well integrated parking that does not dominate the street environment, particularly where high density housing is proposed;
- o positively addresses sustainability considerations in the layout and the building design;
- o take the opportunity to encourage community interaction by creating layouts with a strong neighbourhood focus/centre; larger (300+ unit) schemes will also normally be expected to incorporate a mixed use element;
- o optimises the potential of the site to accommodate development'.

The Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD also provides advice for extensions to dwellings. Principle DG49 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 relates specifically to side extensions and states that:

'Side extensions should normally be subservient to the original dwelling and typically be set-back from the front of the house to help define the original building.

The gaps between dwellings can sometimes positively contribute to articulating (for example, through the consistent rhythm of repeated houses) and adding interest in a street frontage or by providing views / visible connections to the surrounding countryside. Side extensions will therefore need to appropriately respond to the character of the street form and will not normally be accepted where they close an important gap and view'.

With regards to rear extensions, principle DG51 of the Design Guide sets out:

'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'.

Principle DG52 of the Design Guide states that if dormer windows or rooflights are out of scale or character with the roofscape and proportions of the dwelling they can have an adverse impact on both the dwelling and the streetscape. Where a clear rhythm of fenestration is established, the position and proportion of dormer windows should respond to this.

The application site is situated within the built up area of Lindfield, in an established residential area. The western side of William Allen Lane is characterised by detached bungalows that have central eyebrow, dormer windows.

Planning permission is firstly sought for extensions to the side and rear of the dwelling. With regards to the rear extensions, these would comprise ground floor and first floor additions. It is considered that the ground floor addition would appear proportionate in scale to the host dwelling and would be of a design that appropriately reflected the existing building. As there is a public footpath to the rear of the house there would be some views to this extension however, given that it would be appropriate in design terms to the host dwelling, it would not have an adverse impact on the character of the area.

With regards to the first floor addition, these extensions do not normally relate successfully to bungalows. This is because they do not respond appropriately to the low eaves lines or successfully

integrate into the existing building, resulting in harm to the character of the property. It is acknowledged that the proposed first floor extension has similarities to a dormer window. Neighbouring dwellings to the north have large, flat roof, box dormer windows to the rear and first floor additions have been undertaken to the south. The most recent was a planning permission granted at 7 William Allen Lane (DM/21/3060). The report for this application stated:

'The proposed 8.4m wide (approx.) dormer is located on the rear roofslope. This size of flat roof dormer, whilst not inkeeping with the aims of the design guide for roof additions, reflects the scale and form of other roof additions made to similar chalet style properties at Nos 9 and 11. Notwithstanding this the proposed dormer is set down from the ridge level, up from the eaves and the original roof form can still be seen on the rear elevation. As the dormer is set behind the bulk of the roof form and will not be publicly visible, and given the precedent of the neighbouring additions, this element of the proposal is supported in this case'.

The first floor addition currently under consideration would also be set down from the ridge and sides of the existing roof. It is also considered that the proposed pitched roof would appear more sympathetic than the flat roof extensions that have been undertaken in neighbouring properties. Given these site specific circumstances it is considered that, in this instance, this aspect of the proposal would be acceptable.

In terms of the side extension, this aspect would remain single storey and would not be sited forward of the existing garage building. Whilst it would increase in height, a dummy pitched roof is proposed that would reflect the arrangement at No. 7. The height of the addition is such that it would not result in an important gap or view being wholly enclosed and, as such, it is considered that this extension would be acceptable.

Planning permission is lastly sought for works to the driveway. Whilst the loss of garden space is regrettable, it is noted that similar works have been undertaken to neighbouring bungalows. It is therefore considered that this element of the scheme would not appear wholly incongruous within this area. The Local Highway Authority have also commented on this and no safety concerns have been raised. The recommended informative, advising the applicant of their responsibilities under the Highways Act, can be attached to any consent.

Impact to amenity

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan seeks to ensure that development:

'does 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 (see Policy DP29);'

The proposed single storey side extension would be positioned closest to 7 William Allen Lane. This neighbour has a first floor side window that faces the application site and is situated at a lower land level. It is noted that the proposed side addition would be taller and deeper than the existing garage structure. No. 7, however, is set away from the shared boundary by their garage and the approved plans for DM/21/3060 show this opening as a secondary bedroom window. Whilst this extension may therefore impact the light and outlook available to this first floor side window, it is considered that the harm would not be significant enough to warrant the refusal of this application. With regards to the rear extensions, whilst this neighbour has also extended to the rear, given the separation distance between the two, a significant loss of light or outlook would not occur to the rear windows of No. 7. No windows are proposed that would result in any direct overlooking to this neighbour.

To the south of the site is 3 William Allen Lane. This neighbour has a dormer window and conservatory within close proximity to the shared boundary. The only side glazing within the conservatory are high level windows along the elevation. Both the conservatory and the proposed rear extensions are set away from the boundary line. Additionally the proposed extensions have been designed with pitched roofs that slope away from this neighbour, thereby reducing the bulk and mass in proximity to No. 5. As such it is considered that whilst there could be some impact to light and outlook arising from the proposed rear

extensions, the harm would not be significant enough to warrant the refusal of this application. There are no windows proposed that would result in any direct overlooking to No. 3.

Due to the domestic nature of the proposed development there would not be a harmful impact in terms of noise, air or light pollution.

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

In conclusion, the proposal would accord with the requirements of policies DP26 and DP21 of the Mid Sussex District Plan. The development is therefore considered to be acceptable.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Caroline Grist