

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/3023	Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Replacement garage and two storey side extension to the East. New roof light to South elevation. New French doors to South elevation replacing existing single door. Replacement of bay window to the west elevation and extending to the first floor.		
Site:	2 By Sunte, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2DF, , ,		
Validation Date	25 Nov 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	22 Dec 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	16 Jan 2026
Target Date:	20 Jan 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Stefan Galyas</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Joanne Fisher</i>	Date:	19 Jan 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/3023

**2 By Sunte, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2DF, ,
Replacement garage and two storey side extension to the East. New roof light to South elevation. New French doors to South elevation replacing existing single door. Replacement of bay window to the west elevation and extending to the first floor.
Mr M McGlinchey**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

There were no letters of representation received in response to the proposed development.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

MSDC Drainage: No objection.

The Environment Agency: No objection.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No objection.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for a two storey side extension to both the eastern and western elevations. A new set of French doors would be added to the southern elevation at ground floor level and a rooflight would be added to the southern roof pitch.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/25/0416 - Proposed replacement garage and single storey side extension to the East and two storey side extension to the West. Permission 24.06.2025.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site is a two storey detached dwelling located in a residential setting of largely detached properties. Although on the southern side of By Sunte, the site occupies a corner plot location with its western flank located along the eastern side of Portsmouth Lane.

The nearest neighbour, and those most likely to be affected by the proposals, are located just beyond the boundary to the south at 24 Portsmouth Lane and to the east at 4 By Sunte.

A 'main river' watercourse runs through the garden.

In policy terms the site is within the built up area of Lindfield. It also falls within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and is within the Area of Townscape Character defined within the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposal would develop a two storey side (eastern) extension which would measure at approximately 8.1m in length, 2.9 wide, 5.3m high to the eaves and 7.4m high to the ridge.

The proposal would also develop a two storey side (western) extension which would measure at circa 2.5m in length, 1.5m wide, 5.1m high to the eaves and 6.5m high to the ridge when measured from the highest adjacent natural ground floor level.

Further alterations would be carried out to the southern elevation through the addition of a French door at ground floor level and a rooflight to the southern roof slope.

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 the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural 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:

DP26: Character and Design

DP41: Flood Risk and Drainage

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

Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan (Made March 2016)

Policy 7: Areas of Townscape Character

Mid Sussex District Plan 2021-2039 Consultation Draft

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 and 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:

DPS1 - Climate Change

DPS2 - Sustainable Design and Construction

DPS4 - Flood Risk and Drainage

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)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 is a material consideration. Paragraphs 2, 8, 11, 39, 48, 131, 135, 139 & 181.

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
- Impact on Neighbouring Amenities
- Flood Risk and Drainage
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Design and Character

DP26 of the 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:

- o is of high-quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace;*
- o 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;*
- o creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape;*
- o protects open spaces, trees and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;*
- o 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'*

Policy 7 of the Neighbourhood Plan states that:

'Development proposals in an Area of Townscape Character will be supported, provided applicants can demonstrate they have had regard to their impact on the character and appearance of the area and have sought to retain features important to the character of the area, as defined in the Lindfield Village Design Statement. In particular, proposals should:

- i. retain trees, frontage hedgerows and walls which contribute to the character and appearance of the area;*
- ii. retain areas of open space, (including private gardens) which are open to public view and contribute to the character and appearance of the area; and*
- iii. avoid the demolition of existing buildings which contribute to the character and appearance of the area.'*

Principle DG49 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide states:

'Extensions should typically use simple, uncomplicated building forms to compliment and coordinate with the scale, form and massing of the original dwelling. The design approach may benefit from coordinating with the existing pattern of window and door openings as well as employing facing materials to match those of the existing dwelling. Otherwise, it should demonstrate the appropriateness of the alternative approach.'

Principle DG50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide elaborates further on what constitutes 'good design' in relation to side extensions:

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 two proposed side extensions would likely increase the properties overall size, scale and bulk. The proposed side (west) extension would likely be read as subservient towards the host dwelling due to its offset from the original dwellings ridge height. To the eastern elevation, the proposed extension would match the existing ridge height. The use of matching external materials would however help the proposal assimilate in with the existing.

There is an existing visual gap at first floor level between the application site and No.4 to the east. It is considered that whilst the proposal would result in the built form at first floor level being closer than the existing arrangement, the proposal would not constitute an overdevelopment of the site. The proposal would retain a substantial area of garden amenity space within the prominent corner plot. Furthermore, the current proposal would measure at a slightly lower floor space than the previously permitted extant permission under DM/25/0416.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy DP26 of the District Plan, Policy 7 of the Lindfield Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant principles of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenities

In terms of impact upon neighbouring amenities, Policy DP26 in part seeks to ensure that 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 (see DP29);'*

There are a number of windows to the neighbouring properties side (western) elevation which would face back towards the proposed side (east) elevation extension. Principle DG47 of the Design Guide states among other matters that all dwellings should benefit from daylight and sunlight levels that conform to BRE (Better Regulation Executive) standards. Further guidance is set out within the "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice" document. The "25 degree approach" should be taken whereby a 25 degree line is drawn from the centre of the lowest opposite habitable room. If the neighbouring properties window lies beneath the 25 degrees as measured, then the building will not likely cause a significant reduction in light received to the concerned window. This guidance is taken as a rule of thumb and each planning application is assessed based on its own merits.

The neighbouring dwelling at No.4 is set circa 4.4m away from the shared boundary with No.2 at its closest point. There is an existing unobscured glazed window at ground floor level, albeit featuring glazing bars which serves as a secondary window to a family room. When assessed against the 25 degree test, the neighbouring window would likely fail, with part of the roof form falling within the line. The family room impacted would however continue to receive light from the other two southern elevation windows which would likely allow sufficient light to be supplied.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered to comply with the provisions of DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan in terms of neighbouring amenities.

Flood Risk and Drainage

Policy DP41 of the District Plan states in part that:

'Proposals for development will need to follow a sequential risk-based approach, ensure development is safe across its lifetime and not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. The District Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) should be used to identify areas at present and future flood risk from a range of sources including fluvial (rivers and streams), surface water (pluvial), groundwater, infrastructure and reservoirs.'

Particular attention will be paid to those areas of the District that have experienced flooding in the past and proposals for development should seek to reduce the risk of flooding by achieving a reduction from existing run-off rates.'

Paragraph 181 of the NPPF states that:

'When determining any planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific floodrisk assessment⁶³. Development should only be allowed in areas at risk of flooding where, in the light of this assessment (and the sequential and exception tests, as applicable) it can be demonstrated that:

- a) within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location;*
- b) the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient such that, in the event of a flood, it could be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment;*
- c) it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate;*
- d) any residual risk can be safely managed; and*
- e) safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan.'*

The Environment Agency have commented in response to the proposed development and have raised no objection towards the proposal. A condition has however been recommended that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted flood risk assessment.

Furthermore, Mid Sussex District Council's Drainage Engineer has been consulted in response to the proposal and also raised no objection. It was commented as an advisory that the Applicant considers the resistance and resilience measures suggested by the Environment Agency.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to comply with the provisions of Policy DP41 of the District Plan and the NPPF.

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

In conclusion, the proposal is appropriate in terms of design, will not negatively impact on the host dwelling nor its immediate setting, will not harm neighbouring amenities and result in an acceptable flood risk impact.

The proposal will comply with Policies DP26 and DP41 of the District Plan, Policy 7 of the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan, the MSDC Design Guide and the requirements of the NPPF.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Stefan Galyas