

From: Emily Wade <Emily.Wade@midsussex.gov.uk>
Sent: 22 September 2026 15:01:59 UTC+01:00
To: "Stefan Galyas" <Stefan.Galyas@midsussex.gov.uk>
Subject: 33 Denmans Lane, Lindfield DM/26/1507

Hi Stefan

Please find below comments on the above planning application.

33 Denmans Lane is an unlisted detached house located to the southern side of Denmans Lane, diagonally opposite its junction with Compton Road. It is not within the Lindfield Conservation Area, but is directly adjacent to its boundary, and therefore within its setting. It is a much-extended mid-20th century house with a sprawling footprint. The core of the house is of two storeys and is in a loosely vernacular style, having brick and hung tile elevations, under a tiled gabled roof with a prominent brick chimney stack. Later additions apparently include a two-storey extension to the western side of the house, and a single storey infill extension linking the garage and house to its eastern side.

Although the Council does not have an adopted character appraisal for the Lindfield Conservation Area, the Council's document '*Conservation Areas in Mid Sussex*' includes a brief high-level analysis of its key features, which include its strong individual village identity. Parts of the eastern end of Denmans Lane, nearest to the High Street, are within the Conservation Area; the section to the west of this which is within its setting, which includes the application site, has a narrow, verdant, semi-rural nature which contributes to the appreciation of the 'village' character of the Area and provides a sense of separation from the more suburban development further to the west between Lindfield and Haywards Heath. The application site, including the vernacular style of the house, and the gardens within which it is located which feature dense hedgerow planting to the roadside boundary, contribute positively to the semi-rural nature of the street scene and to the setting of the Conservation Area.

Although the western end of the frontage to the site is currently of relatively tall and dense planting, which largely screens the house from view at least in summer, the eastern end is quite open so that this part of the house is clearly visible from within the Conservation Area at the junction of Denmans Lane and Compton Road. In addition, it is likely that glimpsed views of the rear of the building would be obtained from allotment gardens to the south of Denmans Lane, and from the path which runs from Denmans Lane to Pondcroft Road, particularly in winter.

The current proposal is for substantial further extensions to the house including two-storey and single-storey side and rear extensions, a first-floor front extension and a new front porch, replacing two existing porches.

Firstly, I would note that the submitted existing plans are not accurate in that they do not show the chimney stack to the main house. This should be corrected, partly to confirm that the intention is to retain the stack, as its removal would be considered contentious. No existing or proposed roof plans have been provided, nor any sections- these would be required for a fully informed assessment of the proposal. In my opinion the description of development is also misleading as the addition to the front elevation is at first, not second floor level.

In my opinion, based on the incomplete information in front of us, the proposal raises a number of concerns both in relation to the impact on the setting of the Conservation Area, and in terms of compliance with the Council's adopted Design Guide:

- Given the extent to which the original house has already been added to in my opinion the principle of further extensions of the scale now proposed would be regarded as contentious. The Council's Design Guide requires at Principle DG49 that extensions should 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. In my opinion, the proposed rear and front extensions to the house are such that they would be overwhelming in their scale in relation to the core of the building, such that the form of the original house would no longer be perceivable. This fails to meet the requirements of the Design Guide, and would detract from the contribution which the house makes through setting to the significance of the Conservation Area.
- The proposed two storey extension to the side and rear of the house extends across the existing single storey link between the house and garage. This reduces the distinction between the two, increases the apparent bulk of the building overall, and further exacerbates the inappropriate relationship of scale between the original house and the extensions to it. In addition, it will partially block existing attractive views from the direction of the Conservation Area looking over the roof of the link to a line of trees beyond. This also detracts from the contribution made by the site to the setting of the Area.
- Although as noted above a full suite of plans has not been included with the application, it would appear that the proposed rear and side extension has a crown roof form. The front extension is also possibly under a crown roof, although this is less clear. This is not sympathetic to the more traditional pitched, hipped and barn hipped roofs of the existing assemblage, and further detracts from the character of the house. The elevational proportions of the extensions, including the relative height of the eaves height, further exacerbate the awkward relationship with the existing building.

In summary, although in my opinion there may be scope for a more modest scheme to extend and rationalise the existing building, the current proposal because of its scale, form and design detracts from the character and appearance of the house, and its contribution to the street scene of Denmans Lane and the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area.

The proposal therefore results in harm, through impact on setting, to the significance of the Lindfield Conservation Area. I would place this harm at the low-mid range of the scale sitting beneath substantial harm or total loss of significance, such that 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.

In my opinion, given the extent of issues with the proposal, the applicant would be best advised to withdraw the current application and seek pre-application advice on a reduced scheme.

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