

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/3074	Case Officer:	Andrew Horrell
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed two storey side extension with juliette balcony to first floor side elevation		
Site:	12 Felbridge Court, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 2NP, , , ,		
Validation Date	23 Jan 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	13 Feb 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	9 Mar 2026
Target Date:	20 Mar 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Andrew Horrell

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	1
--	--	-------------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	10 Mar 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/3074

**12 Felbridge Court, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 2NP, , ,
Proposed two storey side extension with juliette balcony to first floor side elevation
Mr G Martis**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

A letter of comment was received from No.6 Longwell that the block plan is incorrect.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEE COMMENTS

Southern Water: Close to public sewer and under Part H of the building regulations requires approval from Southern Water.

TOWN COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No comment

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought for a two storey side extension with Juliette balcony to first floor side elevation.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

12/01018/FUL - Single storey extension (approved)
13/00345/FUL - Single storey extension. (approved)

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

12 Felbridge Court is a two-storey hipped roofed end of terrace dwelling within a cul-de-sac off Copthorne Road. Felbridge Court is characterised by Georgian style dwellings characterised by face brickwork, plain tiled roofs with upvc doors and windows. The dwelling is characterised by an existing single storey flat roofed side extension and first floor Juliet balcony serving bedroom 2 on the western elevation.

To the north of the site is the highway with allocated garaging beyond, to the south of the site is the rear garden with woodland beyond, to the east of the site is the adjoining No.11 and to the west of the site is a large side garden with woodland to neighbouring Birches View beyond.

The site is within the built-up area of East Grinstead.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The existing single storey side extension is to be removed which approximately measures 3.7m in depth, 3.5m in width with a flat roofed height of 2.8m with the roof lantern creating an overall height of 3.05m.

The proposed two storey side extension measures 9.065m in depth, 6m in width with an approximate height to eaves of 4.7m and overall height of 8.3m to match the existing eaves and ridge height of the dwelling. This will serve an open plan kitchen/dining room/ family area on the ground floor with two bedrooms and en-suites on the first floor.

Internal works include existing bedroom 3 changed to an office and on the ground floor the existing dining room altered to serve an enlarged living room.

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, the Sites Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) and the East Grinstead 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)

WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments - September 2020

Site Allocations DPD

East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan (made November 2016)

Relevant policies:

EG3 (Promoting Good Design)
EG12 (Car Parking)

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 stage 1 hearings were concluded on the 31st October 2024. There are unresolved objections to some of the Policies in the draft District Plan. 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:

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.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 is a material consideration. Paragraphs 8, 11, 131 and 135 are considered to be relevant to this application.

ASSESSMENT

Design and Character

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 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:

- *is of high quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace;*
- *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;*
- *creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape;*
- *protects open spaces, trees and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;*
- *protects valued townscapes and the separate identity and character of towns and villages;*
- *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);*
- *creates a pedestrian-friendly layout that is safe, well connected, legible and accessible;*
- *incorporates well integrated parking that does not dominate the street environment, particularly where high density housing is proposed;*
- *positively addresses sustainability considerations in the layout and the building design;*
- *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;*
- *optimises the potential of the site to accommodate development'.*

East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan policy EG3 states:

'Planning permission will normally be granted where development proposals meet the following criteria:

- o The form of the proposed development is proportionate and in keeping with the scale, height, materials and site coverage of the surrounding area;*
- o The layout of the proposed development respects the topography and character of the site, protects important landscape features and does not harm adjoining amenity;*
- o The proposal does not result in the loss of buildings or spaces that would have an unacceptable impact on the character of the area;*
- o The proposal ensures satisfactory means of access for vehicles and pedestrians and provides adequate parking, cycle storage and refuse facilities on site;*
- o The design of new buildings and the layout of spaces, including footways, car and cycle parking areas, should be permeable and provide connectivity with neighbouring areas;*
- o New development must be inclusive and where appropriate make satisfactory provision for the safe and easy access for those with mobility impairment; and*
- o The design of new developments must result in the creation of a safe and secure environment and incorporate adequate security measures and features to deter crime, fear of crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour; and*
- o Proposals make provision for green infrastructure and biodiversity enhancement.'*

The Mid Sussex Design Guide is also considered to be relevant and principle DG49 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 DG50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide relates specifically to side extensions and states:

'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'

The proposed side extension is a fair enlargement, but only a modest increase on the existing single storey side extension. The design in terms of materials, eaves and ridge height matches the existing dwelling. Given the size of the plot, the development is not deemed to be overdevelopment of the site. The Juliette balcony matches the existing balcony on the side elevation of the dwelling.

Therefore, the proposal is deemed to comply with DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan, the relevant principles of the Mid Sussex Design Guide and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Parking Provision

As the dwelling is to increase from a 3 to a 4-bedroom dwelling, parking standards has to be assessed.

East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan contains Policy EG12 which is relevant in the determination of this application, which states:

'Policy EG12 - Car Parking

Planning permission will only be granted where vehicle-parking provision, including cycle parking, is in accordance with West Sussex County Council adopted parking standards and it does not dominate the street scene. In exceptional circumstances, a departure from the adopted standards will be supported if the applicant can demonstrate specific local circumstances require a different level of parking provision, including as a result of the development site's accessibility to public transport, shops and services, highway safety concerns and local on-street parking problems. For this to be accepted a Transport Assessment will be required together with a set of proposals to justify this alternative provision'.

Principle DG19 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide which whilst related to new development layout states:

'Off-street parking in front of houses should normally be avoided. This is likely to result in environments dominated by hard surfaces and generates greater face to face building distances leading to weaker street enclosure unless combined with taller building frontages'. Whilst the proposed does not particularly comply with this principle, the principle relates primarily with new developments in which the parking and garaging arrangements can be controlled'.

The drawings outline that the proposed dwelling will be served by four bedrooms.

West Sussex County Council Guidance on Parking sets out the recommended parking standards for residential houses. For a 4-bed property in this location in East Grinstead, 2.2 spaces should be provided.

The dwelling has an allocated double garage with unrestricted on-street parking.

Therefore, the proposal will accord with the WSCC parking standard requirements for a 4-bed house in this part of East Grinstead and the proposal complies within the above-mentioned part of policy DP21 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policy EG12 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan and the West Sussex County Council Parking Standards Guidance.

Neighbouring Amenities

In terms of impact on neighbouring amenities, Policy DP26 of the District Plan states that it must be demonstrated that any development 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.

The threshold for the related policy within the East Grinstead neighbourhood Plan EG3 states:

'The layout of the proposed development respects the topography and character of the site, protects important landscape features and does not harm adjoining amenity'.

Under section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 if a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan, the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approved or published. Consequently, policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan is considered to take precedence and therefore the test in this instance is whether the development causes significant harm to neighbouring amenities as outlined above.

Given the location of the extension in relation to neighbouring properties, the impact on light and outlook.

In terms of outlook, given the distance to the nearest neighbour with direct view from the first-floor side windows is approximately 75m, the level of harm in terms of overlooking and privacy is not deemed harmful.

Therefore, the level of harm in terms of neighbouring amenities is therefore not deemed significant and therefore the proposal is deemed to comply with policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and policy EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan.

Other

Concerns about the inaccuracy of the block plan have been raised, the plans have therefore been amended to accurately reflect the relationship with the neighbours in Longwall.

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.

CONCLUSION

The proposal is considered to be of an appropriate design, size and scale that is in keeping with the existing dwelling and will not cause harm to the surrounding area. The level of harm to neighbouring amenities is not deemed significant and allows for sufficient off street parking provision.

In conclusion, the proposal is considered to be appropriate in terms of design, size, and scale to the dwellinghouse and locality and would not cause significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties. Therefore, the proposal complies with Mid Sussex District Plan policies DP21 and DP26 and policies EG3 and EG12 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan, The Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD, West Sussex Parking standards guidance as well as the relevant provisions of the NPPF.

The application therefore accords with the Development Plan and is considered acceptable.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Andrew Horrell