

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/0311	Case Officer:	Catherine Cardin
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Demolish existing building to rear. Proposed erection of a two storey rear extension. Alterations to South elevation. Decking to rear elevation with steps down to garden level and high privacy screen. Replacing window to existing kitchen with French doors and glass handrail. Addition of a log burner and flue.		
Site:	Bentley Cottage, Wickham Hill, Hurstpierpoint, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9NP, ,		
Validation Date	16 Feb 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	11 Mar 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	7 Apr 2026
Target Date:	13 Apr 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Catherine Cardin</i>

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	0
---	--	------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	8 Apr 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/0311

**Bentley Cottage, Wickham Hill, Hurstpierpoint, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9NP,
Demolish existing building to rear. Proposed erection of a two storey rear extension. Alterations to South elevation. Decking to rear elevation with steps down to garden level and high privacy screen. Replacing window to existing kitchen with French doors and glass handrail. Addition of a log burner and flue.**

Acton / Hillier

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Southern Water

No objection.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

The committee recommends that MSDC grant permission.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought to demolish an existing building to the rear, to erect a 2-storey rear extension, alterations to the southern elevation, decking to rear elevation, steps to garden level, install French doors and a glass handrail and to install a log burner and flue.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/25/2684- Demolish existing garden room and replace with new for ancillary use to the main dwelling. Permission.

DM/25/2691- Rear extension. Internal alterations. Alterations to South Elevation. Decking to rear elevation with steps down to garden level. Replacing window to existing kitchen with french doors & glass handrail. Permission.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Bentley Cottage is a detached two storey dwelling. It is constructed of red brick, with a plain tile roof and timber sash windows. The property is characterised by tile hanging to the first-floor elevation and a gabled front projection. The property benefits from an attached garage and off-road parking to the front of the property. The property has a several outbuildings to the side and rear of the property.

The property is located within the built-up area boundary of Hurstpierpoint. Neighbouring properties are located to the east and west. Highway is located to the south, whilst open countryside is located to the north.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The application seeks planning permission to demolish an existing building and to construct a two-storey rear extension, make alterations to the front elevation, install decking to the rear elevation, install steps

down to garden level, install French doors and to install a glass handrail and to install a log burner and flue.

The rear extension would measure some 5.6 metres in width and some 2.2 metres in depth. This would have a dual pitched roof with a maximum height of some 8.6 metres. It is proposed to install a log burner flue on the rear (northern) roof pitch. It is also proposed to install 2 no. French doors at ground floor level and 2 no. windows at first floor level on the rear (northern) elevation. It is proposed to use the extension as a sitting room at ground floor level and a bedroom at first floor level.

The alterations to the front (southern) elevation include removing the existing garage door and installing a new window to match the existing.

Plans show that it is also proposed to install 2 no. French doors, 1 no. floor to ceiling window and 1 no. glass handrail on the rear (northern) elevation.

The proposal seeks permission to install decking on the rear (southern) elevation. This would span the width of the house and would have a maximum width of some 20.5 metres and a maximum depth of some 5.2 metres.

Finally, permission is sought to install steps from the decking to garden level.

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 Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common 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

Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan made in 2015.

There are 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 hearings were concluded on the 19th March 2026. The District Plan remains at Examination until the Inspector has published his report, until that time 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

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)

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
- Parking arrangements
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Design and Character

Policy DP26 of the District Plan relates to character and design and requires all proposals to be well designed and reflect the distinctive character of the towns and villages while being sensitive to the countryside as well as addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape. In part the policy requires proposals to be of a high-quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace; and creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape.

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.

Principle DG51 of the Mid Sussex 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.

The locality is characterised by loose knit properties of various ages and designs.

The proposed development would be of a design, form and scale that would appear in proportion to, and in keeping with, the character of the existing dwelling. The rear extension is considered acceptable as it allows the original building to remain the dominant element and demonstrates a clear relationship with the host property. The proposed pair of adjoining pitched roofs would align well with the existing roof form and would coordinate effectively with the overall design of the dwelling. Furthermore, the use of matching external materials is considered sympathetic to the appearance of the host property and ensures a cohesive design approach. Due to its siting at the rear of the property, the proposed rear extension and decking would not result in any harm to the streetscene. The proposed window on the front elevation is considered to align well with the existing fenestration. Overall, the scheme is considered to achieve a cohesive and well-integrated appearance that responds positively to the character of the existing dwelling and represents an improvement on the existing.

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, and principles DG49 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 western side is Birches. Given that the proposal would be offset from the development by some 8.8 metres, it is not considered that the proposal would cause significant harm to the outlook and light of the neighbour. Due to the fact that the proposal would not introduce additional openings on the side elevation it is not considered that the proposal would result in any unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy.

To the eastern side is The Haven. Given that the extension would be offset from the shared boundary by some 27 metres, it is not considered that the proposal would cause significant harm to the outlook and light of the neighbour. As no windows are proposed on the side elevation, it is not considered that the proposal would give rise to overlooking concerns.

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.

Parking arrangements

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 includes the conversion of the existing attached garage. 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 three bedrooms, and one new bedroom is proposed. West Sussex County Council Parking Standards Guidance (2020) outlines that for a 4-bedroom dwelling in this location that 3 parking spaces should be provided. The proposal would retain an external parking space at the front of the house that would

accommodate three cars. 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.

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 policies DP21 and DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan. It is therefore considered acceptable.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Catherine Cardin