

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 September 2026 15:46:08 UTC+01:00
To: "Catherine Cardin" <Catherine.Cardin@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: DM/26/2011 7 Shenstone, Lindfield

Hi Catherine

Comments on the above planning application.

The application site is an unlisted detached house located within a cul-de-sac to the north of Hickman's Lane in Lindfield. It is not within the Conservation Area, but is within its immediate setting, as the boundary runs along the southern side of the garden to the property.

Shenstone is a cul-de-sac development of modest, detached properties constructed during the second half of the 20th century on the site of an early 20th century property of the same name, and an adjacent field. The development is consistent in style but not of any particular architectural interest, and makes at best a neutral contribution to the setting of the Conservation Area. However, the trees and vegetation to the western side of the development (including the rear boundary of the application site), which sit along the adjacent PROW which runs northwards from Hickman's Lane, form an attractive backdrop to the period properties at Hollycroft and Rosemary House, which are within the Area, and contribute positively to its setting and significance, which lies primarily in its nature as the core of a historic Sussex village.

The current proposal is for the construction of a first-floor level extension over an existing single storey rear addition to the property. The proposed extension would sit across almost the full width of the rear elevation at first floor, meaning that when viewed in conjunction with the existing ground floor level addition the original rear elevation of the house would be almost entirely concealed, notwithstanding the slight set down in ridge height of the proposed extension in comparison to the main roof.

In my opinion, the proposal raises concerns in terms of compliance with the Council's adopted Design Guide and of the impact on the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area.

The height and bulk of the addition are such that when viewed in conjunction with the existing ground floor level extension, the additions to the property would appear to overwhelm the original house, such that its form could no longer be perceived in views from the rear (noting that partial views are obtainable from the adjacent public footpath). This would be contrary to the requirements of the Design Guide, which states at Principle DG49 that extensions should 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, the extended side elevation of the building at first floor would be visible looking northwards from Hickman's Lane, detracting from the currently verdant backdrop of the period houses mentioned above. This would detract from the setting of this part of the Conservation Area and hence from its character and appearance. There would also be some adverse impact on the approach to the Conservation Area along the PROW, due to the potentially overbearing nature of the addition.

For these reasons, in my opinion the proposal results in a low level of harm, falling within the scale lying beneath substantial harm or total loss of significance, to the Lindfield Conservation Area. As such, the balancing exercise set out in paragraph HE6.4 of the new NPPF will apply.

In undertaking this exercise, which is a matter for the Case Officer, it should be noted that the NPPF requires that substantial weight should be given to an asset's conservation (HE6.1), and that any harm to a designated asset shall be of considerable importance and weight (HE6.3).

Paragraphs HE4.1 and HE4.2 will also be relevant. HE4.1 requires that development proposals should avoid or minimise harm to the significance of heritage assets, and instead conserve this significance. HE4.2 requires that any harm to, or loss of significance of a heritage asset should have a clear and convincing justification.

The proposal is also contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35 and of the Council's adopted 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