

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/2235	Case Officer:	Catherine Cardin
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed works to extend the side and rear of the existing dwelling to provide a larger living areas to the ground floor and an additional bedroom space at first floor.		
Site:	23 Meadow Drive, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2RS, , ,		
Validation Date	4 Sep 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	30 Sep 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	24 Oct 2025
Target Date:	30 Oct 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Catherine Cardin</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Steven King</i>	Date:	24 Oct 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/2235

**23 Meadow Drive, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2RS, ,
Proposed works to extend the side and rear of the existing dwelling to provide a larger living
areas to the ground floor and an additional bedroom space at first floor.
Mr And Mrs Casey**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

MSDC Flood risk and drainage

No objection, subject to condition.

Southern Water

No objection.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No objection.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought for a side and rear extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

LF/025/99- Demolish existing single storey extension and construct new single storey extension.
Permission.

DM/24/2933- Proposed demolition of existing garage and erection of a two storey rear and side
extension and new front porch. Withdrawn.

DM/25/0466- Proposed side and rear single storey extensions. Withdrawn.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. The property is characterised by red brick, white upvc fenestration with tile hanging to the first-floor front elevation and a pantile roof. The property benefits from a rear detached garage and a rear single storey extension.

The property is located within the built-up area boundary of Lindfield, as defined by the MSDC Local Plan. Neighbouring properties are located to the northeast and southwest. Highway is located to the northwest.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The application seeks planning permission to demolish an existing detached single garage and to construct a two-storey rear and side extension and single storey porch extension.

The rear extension on the ground floor would have a maximum width of some 2.6 metres and a maximum depth of some 4.9 metres. It is proposed to install aluminium bifold doors on the rear (southern) elevation, a structural glazed window to form a window seat and 1 no. altered rooflight. It is proposed to use the rear extension as a snug and utility.

The side extension on the ground floor would have a maximum width of some 1.7 metres and a depth of some 10.6 metres. The proposal seeks to install no. 3 windows and a door on the side (northern) elevation ground floor. These would be obscure glazed. It is also proposed to install a roller style garage door on the front (northern) elevation. It is proposed to use the side extension as a WC, office and store.

The extension on the first floor would have a maximum depth of some 13.7 metres and a maximum width of some 4.4 metres. This would have a gabled roof with a height to the ridge of some 5.8 metres and a height to the eaves of some 5.1 metres.

The first-floor rear extension would have a gabled roof with tiles to match the existing. It is proposed to use this as a bedroom and a bathroom. To accommodate the first-floor extension, it is also proposed to extend the existing roof by some 1.8 metres. This would have tiles to match the existing. It is also proposed to install a new window on the first-floor rear elevation, and a window on the first-floor side (northern) elevation which would serve a bathroom.

It is also proposed to install a porch and a new front door on the front (northern) elevation. The porch would measure some 2.2 metres in width and some 2 metres in depth. This would have a pitched roof, with tiles to match the existing.

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 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:

DP21 - Transport

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 in 2016.

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 the 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:

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)

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
- Flood risk and drainage
- Parking provision
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Design and Character

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan relates to design and character and 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 protects valued townscapes and the separate identity and character of towns and villages;
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 (see Policy DP27);
o creates a pedestrian-friendly layout that is safe, well connected, legible and accessible; o incorporates well integrated parking that does not dominate the street environment, particularly where high density housing is proposed;
o positively addresses sustainability considerations in the layout and the building design;
o 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; o optimises the potential of the site to accommodate development.'

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.'

In terms of rear extensions, principle DG51 states that where they

'...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.'

Furthermore, principle DG50 of the MSDC Design Guide relates to side extensions and states that:

'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 locality is characterised by semi-detached dwellings of similar designs and forms. Although the properties are almost entirely uniform in terms of dwelling type, there is significant variation in terms of building lines and gaps between properties. A number of the surrounding semi-detached dwellings have also undergone two storey side extensions, in most cases appearing subordinate to the original dwelling. This means that the loss of symmetry between the semi-detached properties and loss of gaps between the buildings is not as apparent as would be the case were these building lines and gaps consistent. In this application the continuation of the ridgeline and full depth of the dwelling is considered acceptable. There are varied design and style dwellings within the wider street scene of Meadow Drive including semi-detached and blocks of terraces, many of which have undergone alterations. The proposed works would be of a design, form and scale that would appear in proportion and appropriate to the character of the existing dwelling and the street scene.

Parking provision

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 would result in the loss of garage associated with the dwelling. 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. It has been confirmed that the

property currently has three bedrooms. 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. There is an external parking space in front of the house to accommodate at least one car, which would remain. In addition, there are no restrictions on the surrounding roads that would prevent on road parking. 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.

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 southwest is 25 Meadow Drive. Although it is considered that there would be some loss of light to this neighbour, this is not considered significant enough to warrant the refusal of this application. There would be an increase in the built form towards this neighbour. Nonetheless, the habitable room on the eastern side of this property would be some 6.7 metres from the proposal so it is not considered that the harm to the light of this window would be significant. Submitted plans show that the proposed windows on the ground floor of the side elevation would be obscure glazed. Although submitted plans do not show that the bathroom window on the first-floor side elevation would be obscured glazed, this can be secured by a suitably worded condition.

To the northeast is 21 Meadow Drive. Given that there is already an existing single storey rear extension and that the proposed first floor extension would be offset from the shared boundary by some 4.4 metres, it is not considered that the proposal would be harmful to the light and outlook of this neighbour. As no windows are proposed on the side (eastern) elevation, it is not considered that the proposal would give rise to any overlooking concerns.

To the southeast is 14 Grey Alders. A new window is proposed on the first-floor rear elevation. Given that the development would be offset from the shared boundary by some 22 metres, it is not considered that the proposal would give rise to significant overlooking concerns. Given the separation distance, it is also not considered that the proposal would be harmful to the light and outlook of this neighbour.

Due to the residential nature of the proposed development there would not be any significant harm regarding noise, air or light pollution.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would not cause harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore deemed to accord with the above part of policy DP26 of the District Plan.

Flood risk and drainage

Policy DP41 of the MSDC 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.'

The property is within flood zone 1 and is at risk of fluvial flooding and at very low to medium surface water flood risk. MSDC Drainage have been consulted on the application and considers that the proposed development would be classified as a 'minor extension', being less than 250 square metres. Subject to the proposed development incorporating all flood mitigation and resilience measures set out within the Design and Access Statement and Flood Risk Assessment (Dated August 2025, Revision D), including finished floor levels, they have no objection to the proposal.

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 policy DP21, DP26 and DP41 of the Mid Sussex District Plan. It is therefore considered acceptable.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Catherine Cardin