

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/2298	Case Officer:	Catherine Cardin
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Householder application to allow for a two storey side extension, two storey and single storey rear extension, new front porch and new entrance gates.		
Site:	12 Brook Lane, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 1SG, , ,		
Validation Date	11 Sep 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	3 Nov 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	4 Nov 2025
Target Date:	6 Nov 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Catherine Cardin</i>

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	3
--	--	-------------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	5 Nov 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/2298

**12 Brook Lane, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 1SG, ,
Householder application to allow for a two storey side extension, two storey and single storey
rear extension, new front porch and new entrance gates.
Mr And Mrs Nicholas**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

During the initial consultation period, two letters of objection were received. These raised concerns regarding the following:

- Harm to the character of the street scene from the proposed car port and entrance gates
- Overbearing impact of the proposed car port
- Damage to trees and hedging on the eastern side of the property

Following the submission of revised plans and a reconsultation period, no further letters of representation were received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

MSDC Tree Officer

No objection.

Southern Water

No objection.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to this application.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought to construct a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension, new front porch and new entrance gates.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

CU/261/77- Proposed alterations and extension to an existing residential unit. Permission.

LF/018/88- Two storey extension to form dining room and bedroom. Permission.

12/00616/FUL- Proposed single storey rear extension. Permission.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application property is a three-storey detached dwelling. The property is characterised by red brick, with white upvc windows and a plain tile roof. The property benefits from off street parking to the front and side of the property, and an attached garage to the rear. The site slopes to the south.

The property is located within a cul-de-sac within the built-up area boundary of Lindfield. Neighbouring properties are located to the east, west and north. Highway is located to the south.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The application seeks planning permission to demolish an existing garage and to construct a two-storey side extension, single storey rear extension, new front porch and new entrance gates.

The two-storey side extension would have a maximum width of some 2.5 metres and a maximum depth of some 9 metres. This would have a dual hipped roof with a height to the ridge of some 7.7 metres and a height to the eaves of some 5.2 metres. This would have a window on the front (southern) elevation and rear (northern) elevations at ground and first floor level. It is also proposed to install a door with porch roof on the side (eastern) elevation at ground level. This would be finished in materials to match the existing. It is proposed to use this as an office/playroom, WC, boot/utility room on the ground floor and as two ensuite, a family bathroom and a closet at first floor level.

The rear single storey extension would measure some 4.1 metres in width and some 4.3 metres in depth. This would have a crown roof, with a maximum height of some 3.5 metres and a height to the eaves of some 2.6 metres. This would have 1 no. roof lantern and bi-fold doors on the side (western) elevation. This would have facing brickwork and roof tiles to match the existing. It is proposed to use this as a games room on the ground floor.

Submitted plans show it is also proposed to install an outdoor kitchen to the rear garden around the edge of the existing patio.

In addition, it is proposed to construct a new porch on the front (southern) elevation. This would measure some 2.7 metres in width and some 1.2 metres in depth. This would have a gabled tile roof, with a height to the ridge of some 3.5 metres and a height to the eaves of some 2.6 metres. It is also proposed to install a new timber front entrance door.

The proposal seeks to construct garden driveway gates and pedestrian gates at the southern boundary of the property. The entrance gates would measure some 7.2 metres in width and would have a maximum height of some 1.8 metres. These would be finished in natural oiled timber.

Finally, it is also proposed to install new windows and doors on the rear elevation.

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 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:

DP26 - Character and Design

DP37 - Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows

DP41 - Flood Risk and Drainage

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

Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan made in 2016.

Relevant policies:

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

DPS4 - Flood Risk and Drainage

DPB1 - Character and Design

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;

- Design and Character
- Neighbouring Amenities
- Flood risk and Drainage
- Impact on Trees
- Parking Provision
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Design and Character

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan relates to design and character 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.'*

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.

Furthermore, principle DG50 of the MSDC Design Guide relates 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.

In addition, principle DG51 of the MSDC 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.

Concerns were raised during the course of the application regarding the proposed car port and entrance gates and their impact on the character and appearance of the area. Revised plans were submitted which removed the car port from the proposal.

The proposed rear and side extensions would be of an appropriate scale and would be subordinate in height to the existing dwelling. It is considered that the dual hipped roof design of the side extension would coordinate well with the existing property and that the side extension would be of a similar character and design to the existing dwelling. The proposal would not close an important gap or view and the proposed design is considered to address the side boundary and adjacent buildings to the east appropriately. The proposed side extension would be set-back from the front of the house, which would define the original dwelling. It is considered that the first-floor extension roof responds well to the character of the existing building and the set down from the ridge allows the existing property to remain the dominant element.

Although the ground floor rear extension proposes a crown roof and this would result in an overall mixture of crown and hipped roofs, it is considered that this contemporary approach would harmonise well with the existing building. The rear extension would not be visible from the street scene and therefore it is not considered that the proposal would be harmful to the street scene. As the proposal includes wall and roof materials to match the existing, it is considered that the development would provide a consistent finish.

Although the entrance gates are not considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene, it is not considered that the harm caused would warrant the refusal of this application.

The proposal is therefore considered to address the character of the existing dwelling and the surrounding buildings, and as such the proposal is deemed to comply with the above part of policy DP26 of the District Plan, principles DG49, DG50 and DG51 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.

Impact on 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 east is 10 Brook Lane. The proposal would see an increase in the built form towards this neighbour. Whilst it is considered that the proposed two storey extension would cause a loss of light and outlook, it is considered that the level of harm that would occur would not be significant enough to warrant the refusal of this application. As the side extension would have a dual hipped roof, which would slope away from these neighbours, and as these neighbours would be offset from the shared boundary by some 2.3 metres, it is not considered that the development would cause significant overshadowing or enclosure. As no windows are proposed on the side elevation, it is not considered that the proposal would give rise to significant overlooking concerns.

To the west is 14 Brook Lane. Given that this property is set-back in its plot and would be offset from the development by some 22 metres, it is not considered that the proposal would be harmful to the amenities of this neighbour.

To the north is Nautilus and Farthings. Given that the proposal would be offset from the shared boundary by some 42 metres, it is not considered that the proposal would be harmful to the amenities of this neighbour.

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, and the relevant principles of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.

Flood risk and drainage

DP41 of the MSDC District Plan states in part that:

'Proposals for development will need to follow a sequential risk-based approach, ensure development is safe across its lifetime and not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. The District Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) should be used to identify areas at present and future flood risk from a range of sources including fluvial (rivers and streams), surface water (pluvial), groundwater, infrastructure and reservoirs. Particular attention will be paid to those areas of the District that have experienced flooding in the past and proposals for development should seek to reduce the risk of flooding by achieving a reduction from existing run-off rates.'

The property is within flood zone 1 and is at very low risk of fluvial flooding and at very low surface water flood risk. MSDC Drainage have been consulted on the application and considers that the proposed development would be classified as a 'minor extension', being less than 250 square metres. They have raised no objection to the proposal.

Impact on Trees

Policy DP37 of the Mid Sussex Plan relates to trees and states:

'The District Council will support the protection and enhancement of trees, woodland and hedgerows, and encourage new planting. In particular, ancient woodland and aged or veteran trees will be protected.

Development that will damage or lead to the loss of trees, woodland or hedgerows that contribute, either individually or as part of a group, to the visual amenity value or character of an area, and/ or that have landscape, historic or wildlife importance, will not normally be permitted.

Proposals for new trees, woodland and hedgerows should be of suitable species, usually native, and where required for visual, noise or light screening purposes, trees, woodland and hedgerows should be of a size and species that will achieve this purpose.

Trees, woodland and hedgerows will be protected and enhanced by ensuring development:

- o incorporates existing important trees, woodland and hedgerows into the design of new development and its landscape scheme; and*
- o prevents damage to root systems and takes account of expected future growth; and*
- o where possible, incorporates retained trees, woodland and hedgerows within public open space rather than private space to safeguard their long-term management; and*
- o has appropriate protection measures throughout the development process; and*
- o takes opportunities to plant new trees, woodland and hedgerows within the new development to enhance on-site green infrastructure and increase resilience to the effects of climate change; and*
- o does not sever ecological corridors created by these assets.*

Proposals for works to trees will be considered taking into account:

- o the condition and health of the trees; and*
- o the contribution of the trees to the character and visual amenity of the local area; and*
- o the amenity and nature conservation value of the trees; and*
- o the extent and impact of the works; and*
- o any replanting proposals.*

The felling of protected trees will only be permitted if there is no appropriate alternative. Where a protected tree or group of trees is felled, a replacement tree or group of trees, on a minimum of a 1:1 basis and of an appropriate size and type, will normally be required. The replanting should take place as close to the felled tree or trees as possible having regard to the proximity of adjacent properties.

Development should be positioned as far as possible from ancient woodland with a minimum buffer of 15 metres maintained between ancient woodland and the development boundary.'

There are a total of four trees in proximity of the proposal. The MSDC Tree Officer was consulted on the application and considered the proposal. No objection has been raised provided that a condition is included to secure the submitted Arboricultural Implications Assessment. This can be secured by a suitably worded condition.

Parking provision

Policy DP21 of the District Plan states that to meet the objectives of the West Sussex Transport Plan 2011- 2026, decisions on development proposals will take account of whether: *'the scheme provides adequate car parking for the proposed development taking into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the development and the availability and opportunities for public transport; and with the relevant Neighbourhood Plan where applicable;*

It is noted that the proposal would result in the loss of garage parking associated with the dwelling. West Sussex County Council Parking Standards Guidance (2020) outlines the County Council's approach to

parking at new developments to ensure that sufficient parking is provided to meet the needs of the development while maintaining highway network operations, protecting surrounding communities and pursuing opportunities to encourage use of sustainable modes of transport. The property currently has five bedrooms. West Sussex County Council Parking Standards Guidance (2020) outlines that for a 5-bedroom dwelling in this location that 3 parking spaces should be provided. The property has an external parking space at the front of the house that can accommodate three cars, which would remain. In addition, there are no restrictions on the surrounding roads that would prevent on road parking. It is therefore considered that, in this instance, the proposal would be acceptable in terms of highways impact. Therefore, the proposal is deemed to comply with policy DP21 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and the WSCC Parking Standards Guidance.

Other matters

Southern Water have considered the proposal and have requested that a pre commencement condition be attached to any planning permission regarding landscaping proposals in proximity of any public apparatus. However, it is not considered reasonable or necessary to attach this condition given the modest nature of the proposal and the distance of over 8 metres from the boundary of the site. In any regard, this would be a matter for Building Regulations rather than the planning regime.

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 proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of design, size and scale to the dwellinghouse and locality, and would not cause harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties.

In conclusion, the proposal would accord with the requirements of policy DP26, DP37 and DP41 of the Mid Sussex District Plan. It is therefore considered acceptable.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Catherine Cardin