

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 26 November 2025 16:01:09 UTC+00:00
To: "Catherine Cardin" <Catherine.Cardin@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: DM/25/2469 96 North Street, Turners Hill

Hi Catherine

Following on from my previous comments, the application has been revised to largely address the concerns raised. UPVC is still shown as the window material (although the colour of the bifold doors is amended to white)- on balance, given that the existing windows to the house are of the material it is not considered that an objection on this basis could be sustained.

The proposal is therefore considered to meet the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

I would suggest the following conditions:

- Details of roofing and facing materials
- New brickwork to match existing adjacent work in colour, texture and bonding pattern and colour, texture and style of pointing
- Detailed drawings, including sections, at an appropriate large scale, and annotated to show materials and finishes, of the following parts of the scheme:
 - - typical examples of windows and external doors
 - - typical eaves detail
- Rooflights to be flush fitting metal framed conservation style rooflights
- Rainwater goods and other external pipework to be of painted metal

Thanks

Emily

Please note that this advice is given at Officer level only and is without prejudice to the formal decision of the District Council.

Submit your planning application online.
<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk>

Emily Wade Ma MSc
Conservation Officer
Planning Services
Tel: +44 (0)1444 477385
emily.wade@midsussex.gov.uk <http://www.midsussex.gov.uk>



From: Emily Wade

Sent: 03 November 2025 10:38

To: Catherine Cardin <Catherine.Cardin@midsussex.gov.uk>

Subject: DM/25/2469 96 North Street, Turners Hill

Hi Catherine

Comments on the above planning application.

The application site is a semi-detached house, one half of a handed villa pair located within the Turners Hill Conservation Area. The villas date from the late 19th or early 20th century, and are part of a small group of three similar pairs to this part of North Street. The houses are faced in red brick and hung tile with pitched tiled roofs. Although altered and extended, they retain period character and contribute positively to the Conservation Area.

The current proposal appears to be a resubmission of an application first received in 2022. This previous application was eventually given permission, although not until amendments had been made to aspects of the detailed design. As the relevant policy context has not materially altered since this time, the comments made in respect of the original 2022 application remain relevant and I will repeat them here.

The current proposal is for alterations and extensions to the side and rear of the house, including an infill extension to the side of the building, between two existing additions, and a rear extension which is in effect a corner infill between two existing flat roofed additions to the side and rear of the house, replacing on a slightly enlarged footprint an existing conservatory structure, and creating a single wrap-around addition. It is also proposed to face the existing and new flat roofed structure with through coloured render and amend the fenestration, and to add a dormer to the rear roof slope.

The property has already been extended in a number of positions and in other circumstances it might be considered that further additions would overwhelm the original building and its footprint. However the proposed new extensions are relatively modest, particularly in the context of the removal of the existing conservatory and on

balance it is considered that the bulk of the additions, which also will tend to rationalise the existing somewhat convoluted footprint of the building, is acceptable. Also in other circumstances the flat roofed form of the rear extension might not be considered appropriate for the context, but as this sits between two existing flat roofed additions again it is not considered that an objection could be sustained.

Although the principle and form of the ground floor extensions is therefore considered acceptable, aspects of the detailed design require reconsideration. In particular the facing material to the flat roofed element (including the rear extension and adjacent existing additions) is shown as white render. This is not considered sympathetic to the context, and should be amended to brickwork to match the existing to the house. The fenestration is shown as uPVC which is regrettable and should ideally be amended to painted timber, although it is noted that the existing windows to the house have already been unsympathetically replaced with plastic. In any case the rear sliding/folding doors, which are annotated as grey uPVC should be white in colour to match the remainder of the fenestration to the house.

The principle of a dormer to the rear roof slope is likewise not considered contentious, but the window as shown is somewhat oversized and placed high in the roof slope just under ridge height. I would recommend that the scale of this window is reduced and that it is placed more centrally within the height of the roof. This would be in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Design Guide.

Thanks,

Emily

Please note that this advice is given at Officer level only and is without prejudice to the formal decision of the District Council.

Submit your planning application online.
<http://www.planningportal.gov.uk>

Emily Wade Ma MSc
Conservation Officer
Planning Services
Tel: +44 (0)1444 477385
emily.wade@midsussex.gov.uk <http://www.midsussex.gov.uk>

The
Electoral
Commission

You now need
photo ID to
vote at a
polling station

No ID? You can apply for free voter ID

Find out more at

electoralcommission.org.uk/voterID

or call 0800 328 0280