

## Delegated Decision

### Sign off Sheet

|                                              |                                                                    |                                        |                      |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------|
| <b>Ref. No:</b>                              | DM/25/2288                                                         | <b>Case Officer:</b>                   | Stefan Galyas        |
| <b>Application Type:</b>                     | Householder Application                                            |                                        |                      |
| <b>Proposal:</b>                             | Proposed rear dormer, loft conversion and refurbished front porch  |                                        |                      |
| <b>Site:</b>                                 | 4 Tall Oaks, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2QD, , , |                                        |                      |
| <b>Validation Date</b>                       | 11 Nov 2025                                                        | <b>Overall Expiry Date:</b>            | 3 Dec 2025           |
| <b>Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:</b> |                                                                    | <b>Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:</b> |                      |
| <b>Recommendation:</b>                       | Permission                                                         | <b>Recommendation Date:</b>            | 18 Dec 2025          |
| <b>Target Date:</b>                          | 6 Jan 2026                                                         | <b>Recommending Officer Signature:</b> | <i>Stefan Galyas</i> |

|                                                        |  |                               |   |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)</b> |  | <b>No of Representations:</b> | 1 |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|---|

|                              |                    |              |             |
|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|-------------|
| <b>Signed and Agreed By:</b> | <i>Steven King</i> | <b>Date:</b> | 18 Dec 2025 |
| <b>Comments:</b>             |                    |              |             |

## **MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**DM/25/2288**

**4 Tall Oaks, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2QD, ,  
Proposed rear dormer, loft conversion and refurbished front porch  
Standen**

### **SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS**

There was one letter of representation received in response to the original proposal which neither explicitly objected or supported the proposal but raised concerns with regard to the extensions impact on nearby tree preservation order trees.

The proposal was subsequently revised to omit the proposed extension and a further representation letter neither objecting or supporting the proposal was received but raised concerns with regard to the proposals impact on the adjoining neighbouring dwelling's structure and that a full structural survey should be carried out.

### **SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES**

**Southern Water:** No objection.

### **TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS**

**Parish Council:** LRPC note officer concerns relating to design guide friction, therefore ask that these contents are considered by the Planning Committee for determination.

### **INTRODUCTION**

The application seeks planning permission for the development of a rear dormer, a refurbished front porch, the addition of a window to both the principal and side elevations at ground floor level and for skylights throughout.

### **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

03/00007/FUL - Demolition of existing dwelling and out buildings and erection of 13 no. dwellings.  
Permission 05.06.2003.

### **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

The application relates to 4 Tall Oaks, an end of terrace two storey dwelling featuring a hipped roof with a small gable feature to the side elevation. The property also features a single storey hipped roof side element with an offroad driveway position in front. There is existing garden amenity space contained to the rear of the site in a linear format with mature tree planting to the rear boundary. The existing dwelling is composed of brickwork and some tile hanging at first floor, a tiled roof and white uPVC windows.

In terms of the site's locality, there are a number of dwellings positioned within the terrace to the western side of the road as well as some semi-detached dwellings with tile hanging at first floor level adding visual interest.

The site is within the built-up area for Haywards Heath and Lindfield as defined in the District Plan (DP).

### **APPLICATION DETAILS**

The proposal would develop a rear elevation dormer at loft level which would utilise a hipped roof form. The roof would measure at approximately 3.7m in depth, 3m wide, 1.7m high to the eaves and 3.1m high to the ridge. The proposed dormer would be composed of tile hanging to the walls and a tiled roof.

Further alterations would be carried out to the principal elevation, including a low level gate. A new window would also be added to the principal (north-eastern) elevation and to the side (south-eastern) elevation, both at ground floor level. Rooflights would also be added to the front, side and rear roof slopes.

## **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:

DP21: Transport

DP26: Character and Design

### **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.

### **Neighbourhood Plan**

Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan (Made March 2016)

There are no relevant policies.

### **Other Material Considerations**

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 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:

DPS1 - Climate Change

DPS2 - Sustainable Design and Construction

DPB1 - Character and Design

DPT4 - Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure

## *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 (NPPF) 2024 is a material consideration. Paragraphs 2, 8, 11, 39, 48, 115-117, 131, 135 & 139.

## **ASSESSMENT**

It is considered that the main issues that need to be considered in the determination of this application are as follows;

- Design and Character
- Impact on Neighbouring Amenities
- Impact on Highways and Parking
- Other Matters
- Biodiversity Net Gain

### **Design and Character**

Policy DP26 of the District Plan 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 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'*

Principle DG49 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide states:

*'Extensions should typically use simple, uncomplicated building forms to compliment 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. Otherwise, it should demonstrate the appropriateness of the alternative approach.'*

With regard to loft conversions and roof extensions, Principle DG52 notes that:

*'A loft conversion is a space efficient means of extending the amount of living accommodation in a dwelling. Roof accommodation is normally reliant on dormer windows and rooflights to provide light and ventilation. However, if they are out of scale or out of character with the roofscape and proportions of a dwelling they can have an adverse impact on the character of both the dwelling and the streetscape. The roof pitch and form are intrinsic to a building's character and roof extensions should be sensitive to this. Roof extensions and dormer windows that alter the existing ridge of the roof or significantly alter the roof profile of a building will not normally be acceptable, particularly on the front roof slope, and where there is a strong established roofline.*

*Where a clear rhythm of fenestration is established, the position and proportion of dormer windows should respond to existing windows and / or doors.'*

The proposed dormer would utilise a hipped roof form in order to minimise its overall size, scale and bulk. The hipped roof is also considered to reflect the existing dwellings roof form and therefore would take cues from its immediate surroundings. It is also considered that the dormer would be set within a relatively visually discrete position in terms of public views.

To the principal elevation, the proposed low-level gate is considered to result in an overall acceptable impact despite its visually prominent position within the context of views from the public realm.

The proposed window additions to both the principal elevation and side elevation at ground floor level are considered to result in an overall limited visual impact. The window to the side (south-east) elevation would likely match the size and appearance of the existing windows along the existing elevation.

A number of rooflights would be added to all of the dwellings roof slopes. The most prominent additions would be to the principal roof slope where two units would be added. Whilst the wider terrace does not feature any existing rooflights, it is considered that the application could not be resisted on this basis in isolation. It is considered that the terraces principal elevation demonstrates several breaks in the roof form with some box front dormers featuring throughout. It is therefore considered that the rooflights would not be breaking an existing uniform roof slope.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to comply with Policy DP26 of the District Plan.

### **Impact on Neighbouring Amenities**

In terms of impact upon neighbouring amenities, Policy DP26 in part 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 DP29);'*

The proposed dormer would likely offer a greater amount of outlook when compared to the current arrangement. However, views towards the neighbouring sites would likely be from obscure angles looking out towards the garden amenity space. As such, it is not considered that the proposal would result in a significant overlooking impact.

The rear elevations bulk would be increased in overall size due to the addition of the rear dormer. Furthermore, the dormer would be set within a close proximity to the shared boundary with the adjoining property to the north-west at No.5. As the proposed dormer would not protrude any further out than the wall of the rear elevation, it is not considered that the proposal would give rise to an unacceptable overbearing impact on the neighbouring properties.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered to comply with the provisions of DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan in terms of neighbouring amenities.

### **Impact on Highways and Parking**

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Additionally, Policy DP21 of the District Plan requires development proposals to protect the safety of road users and pedestrians.

A four-bedroom dwelling in Haywards Heath Franklands would be required to demonstrate 3 off road parking spaces. The existing driveway would provide sufficient space for at least two cars to park. There does not appear to be a defined parking restriction within the site's locality (i.e. double yellow lines) although the road is restricted in its width to allow for on street parking. In any circumstance, the deficit of one parking space is not considered to be sufficiently substantial insofar as to warrant a reason for refusal on this basis.

As such, the proposal is not considered to be contrary to the provisions of DP21 of the District Plan.

### **Other Matters**

Concerns had been raised in response to the proposed development, regarding the schemes impact on the adjoining neighbouring dwelling's structure. It is considered that a full structural survey would not be required for a householder development of this scale and any approved scheme would be required to comply with current building regulations.

#### 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 is appropriate in terms of design and will not negatively impact on the host dwelling nor its immediate setting, will not harm neighbouring amenities and result in an acceptable highways impact.

The proposal will comply with Policies DP21 and DP26 of the District Plan, the MSDC Design Guide and the requirements of the NPPF.

Decision:       Permission

Case Officer: Stefan Galyas