

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/2469	Case Officer:	Catherine Cardin
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed single storey extension to rear elevation, single storey extension to side elevation and new dormer to the rear.		
Site:	96 North Street, Turners Hill, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 4NS, , ,		
Validation Date	30 Sep 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	24 Nov 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	27 Nov 2025
Target Date:	25 Nov 2025	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:	27 Nov 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/2469

**96 North Street, Turners Hill, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 4NS, ,
Proposed single storey extension to rear elevation, single storey extension to side elevation and
new dormer to the rear.
Mr And Mrs Aitken**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Southern Water

No objection.

MSDC Conservation Officer

The application site is a semi-detached house, one half of a handed villa pair located within the Turners Hill Conservation Area. The villas date from the late 19th or early 20th century and are part of a small group of three similar pairs to this part of North Street. The houses are faced in red brick and hung tile with pitched tiled roofs. Although altered and extended, they retain period character and contribute positively to the Conservation Area.

The current proposal appears to be a resubmission of an application first received in 2022. This previous application was eventually given permission, although not until amendments had been made to aspects of the detailed design. As the relevant policy context has not materially altered since this time, the comments made in respect of the original 2022 application remain relevant and I will repeat them here.

The current proposal is for alterations and extensions to the side and rear of the house, including an infill extension to the side of the building, between two existing additions, and a rear extension which is in effect a corner infill between two existing flat roofed additions to the side and rear of the house, replacing on a slightly enlarged footprint an existing conservatory structure, and creating a single wrap-around addition. It is also proposed to face the existing and new flat roofed structure with through coloured render and amend the fenestration, and to add a dormer to the rear roof slope.

The property has already been extended in a number of positions and in other circumstances it might be considered that further additions would overwhelm the original building and its footprint. However the proposed new extensions are relatively modest, particularly in the context of the removal of the existing conservatory and on balance it is considered that the bulk of the additions, which also will tend to rationalise the existing somewhat convoluted footprint of the building, is acceptable. Also in other circumstances the flat roofed form of the rear extension might not be considered appropriate for the context, but as this sits between two existing flat roofed additions again it is not considered that an objection could be sustained.

Although the principle and form of the ground floor extensions is therefore considered acceptable, aspects of the detailed design require reconsideration. In particular the facing material to the flat roofed element (including the rear extension and adjacent existing additions) is shown as white render. This is not considered sympathetic to the context, and should be amended to brickwork to match the existing to the house. The fenestration is shown as uPVC which is regrettable and should ideally be amended to painted timber, although it is noted that the existing windows to the house have already been unsympathetically replaced with plastic. In any case the rear sliding/folding doors, which are annotated as grey uPVC should be white in colour to match the remainder of the fenestration to the house.

The principle of a dormer to the rear roof slope is likewise not considered contentious, but the window as shown is somewhat oversized and placed high in the roof slope just under ridge height. I would recommend that the scale of this window is reduced and that it is placed more centrally within the height of the roof. This would be in accordance with the requirements of the Council's Design Guide.

Further comments received:

Following on from my previous comments, the application has been revised to largely address the concerns raised. UPVC is still shown as the window material (although the colour of the bifold doors is amended to white)- on balance, given that the existing windows to the house are of the material it is not considered that an objection on this basis could be sustained.

The proposal is therefore considered to meet the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

I would suggest the following conditions:

- Details of roofing and facing materials
- New brickwork to match existing adjacent work in colour, texture and bonding pattern and colour, texture and style of pointing
- Detailed drawings, including sections, at an appropriate large scale, and annotated to show materials and finishes, of the following parts of the scheme:
 - typical examples of windows and external doors
 - typical eaves detail
 - Rooflights to be flush fitting metal framed conservation style rooflights
 - Rainwater goods and other external pipework to be of painted metal

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Turners Hill Parish Council have no concerns or objections to the proposed changes outlined in the planning application.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought for a single storey extension to rear elevation, single storey extension to side elevation and a new dormer to the rear.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

TH/044/89- Attic conversion and downstairs shower room and conservatory. Permission.

TH/022/96- Proposed extension of porch to form new hall. Permission.

06/00220/FUL- Demolition of the existing garage and rebuilding a new and larger garage. Permission.

DM/22/1919- Proposed single storey extension to rear elevation, single storey extension to side elevation and new dormer to the rear. Permission.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

No. 96 North Street is a semi-detached period house (late 19th / early 20th century) that has been extended to the side and rear with various additions. The property benefits from a detached timber framed garage / car port set back to the side and rear of the house, with driveway to the front for 2 cars. Land levels fall to the north with the neighbouring property at no. 97 situated at a lower level. In terms of planning policy, the site lies within the built up area of Turners Hill, Turners Hill conservation area and a WSCC archaeological notification area.

APPLICATION DETAILS

This application is a resubmission of the application that was approved under DM/22/1919.

Plans show that the existing conservatory to the rear of the dwellinghouse will be replaced with a single storey extension that adjoins existing ground floor additions. This will measure approximately 3.8 metres wide by 2.7 metres deep by approximately 3.6 metres high with a flat roof and parapet wall that encompasses both adjoining extensions. Plans originally showed that the extension would have a render finish, but have subsequently been amended to show that the extension would be finished with facing brickwork. A set of bi-fold doors are proposed to the rear wall of the extension with two large windows proposed to the northern side elevation. A roof light is also proposed to the flat roof.

A single storey side extension with gable pitched roof is also proposed, to infill between existing ground floor extensions. Plans indicate that this will project approximately 2.75 metres from the northern flank wall of the house and will measure approximately 3 metres wide by 4 metres high. A roof light is proposed to both roof slopes of the extension, with a large window proposed to the northern side wall.

A cottage style dormer window is also proposed to the rear roof slope. Plans have been amended to show the dormer reduced in scale, to measure approximately 1.6 metres wide by 2 metres high and 2.4 metres deep with a gable pitched roof proposed. The dormer window will be clad with tiles to match the existing roof.

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 Turners Hill 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

DP34 - Listed buildings and other heritage assets

DP35 - Conservation areas

Site Allocations DPD

The SADPD was adopted on 29th June 2022. It allocates sufficient housing and employment land to meet identified needs to 2031.

No relevant policies

Neighbourhood Plan

Turners Hill neighbourhood Plan was made in 2016.

Relevant policies:

THP7 - Building extensions and infill development

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

DPB1 - Character and Design

DPB3 - Conservation Areas

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 Impact on conservation area
- Neighbouring amenities
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Design and Impact on conservation area

Policy DP26 of the District Plan relates to character and design and states in part that: *'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 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 DP29);*
- o incorporates well integrated parking that does not dominate the street environment, particularly where high density housing is proposed;'*

The Turners Hill Neighbourhood Plan Policy THP7 relates to extensions and states that:

'Building extensions and infill development which require planning permission will be permitted where they meet the following criteria:

- a) The scale, height and form fit unobtrusively with the surrounding buildings and the character of the street scene taking into account the guidance of the adopted Village Design Statement.*
- b) The development is designed to preserve or better reveal the features that contribute to any significance of the building or surrounding area as a heritage asset, including listed buildings, the Turners Hill Conservation Area or non-designated heritage assets*
- c) Spacing between buildings would respect the character of the street scene.*

- d) Gaps which provide views out of the village to surrounding countryside are maintained.
- e) Materials are compatible with the materials of the existing building where applicable, and adjoining properties in all circumstances.
- f) The traditional boundary treatment of an area is retained and, where feasible, reinforced and
- g) The privacy, daylight, sunlight and outlook of adjoining residents are safeguarded.'

As the site lies within Turners Hill conservation area, section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states:

'In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any powers under any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.'

This stance is reflected under policy DP35 of the District Plan which states in part that:

'Development in a conservation area will be required to conserve or enhance its special character, appearance and the range of activities which contribute to it. This will be achieved by ensuring that:

o New buildings and extensions are sensitively designed to reflect the special characteristics of the area in terms of their scale, density, design and through the use of complementary materials;'

In addition to the above, the Council's Design Guide SPD is a material planning consideration with design principles DG49, DG50, DG51 and DG52 deemed relevant to this application.

Principle DG49 states in part that *'extensions should typically use simple, uncomplicated building forms to complement and coordinate with the scale, form and massing of the original dwelling.'*

DG50 relates to side extensions and states in part 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.'*

DG51 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.'*

DG52 relates to roof extensions and states in part that *'the roof pitch and form are intrinsic to a building's character and roof extensions should be sensitive to this. Roof extensions and dormer windows that alter the existing ridge of the roof or significantly alter the roof profile of a building will not normally be acceptable, particularly on the front roof slope, and where there is a strong established roofline.'*

The Council's Conservation Officer has provided detailed comments on the extensions as originally proposed, which are set out at the beginning of this report.

It is considered that the proposed ground floor extensions are of an appropriate design, form and scale to the existing dwellinghouse, whereby various ground floor extensions have been added. The proposed rear extension should create a more uniform and cohesive appearance to the dwellinghouse and existing additions to the rear, with a parapet wall proposed that encompasses adjoining extensions. The Council's Conservation Officer had objected to the white rendered walls originally proposed to the extension, however, plans have subsequently been amended to show that the extension will be finished with facing brickwork to match the existing dwellinghouse, thereby ensuring that the development appears in keeping and less visually obtrusive within the locality.

Concerns were also raised by the Conservation Officer regarding the proposed dormer window to the rear roof slope, which appeared oversized and sited high with the roof, just below ridge height. Plans have subsequently been amended to show the dormer window reduced in scale and set lower from the ridge of the roof; this element is now considered acceptable with the proposed dormer shown to sit

subordinately within the roof slope. The dormer window will be clad with tiles to match the existing roof, thereby ensuring that the extension blends in with the existing dwellinghouse.

Although the proposed conditions from the Conservation Officer are noted, the previous officer's report under the approved application DM/22/1919 did not consider it necessary to include the conditions as suggested. Due to the amount of information submitted with the current application it is not considered necessary to impose conditions requiring further information.

In light of the above, the proposed extensions are considered in keeping with the existing dwellinghouse in terms of design, form and scale and should not be harmful to the appearance and character of the area.

The proposal is therefore considered to preserve the appearance and character of the conservation area. The proposal therefore accords with policies DP26 and DP35 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and policy THP7 of the Turners Hill Neighbourhood Plan.

Neighbouring amenity

Policy DP26 of the District Plan refers to amenity and states that development 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'*. Policy THP7 of the District Plan states that *'the privacy, daylight, sunlight and outlook of adjoining residents are safeguarded.'*

In cases where there is a discrepancy between District and Neighbourhood Plan policies, legislation states that greater weight should be given to the Plan (and policy) that has been adopted at a later date. In this instance the Turners Hill Neighbourhood Plan was made in March 2016 and the Mid Sussex District Plan adopted in March 2018. As such, it is considered that greater weight should be given to the District Plan policy, DP26, with the test being whether the proposal would result in significant harm to neighbouring amenities.

To the north is 97 North Street. The proposal includes 3 no. large windows to the side (northern) elevation of the extensions, which have potential to overlook no.97. Given that the side windows to the proposed rear extension would be obscured by the existing garage / car port at no.96, with the large window to the side extension also partly obscured by this, it is not considered that the proposal would give rise to significant overlooking or loss of privacy. Taking into account the existing relationship between properties, whereby a number of clear glazed ground floor windows are currently located within the northern elevation of no.96, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in significant harm to adjoining amenities at no.97 in terms of creating overlooking and reducing privacy. Therefore, it is not considered necessary to impose a condition requiring the window to be obscure glazed.

The proposed dormer window to the rear roof slope will be sited a sufficient distance (approx. 23 metres) from the rear boundary with the neighbouring property as to not cause undue overlooking.

Nor is the development considered to be significantly harmful in terms of affecting light levels or outlook to adjoining properties.

The proposal therefore accords with policy DP26 of the District Plan.

Archaeological Impact

The property lies within a grade red WSCC Archaeological Notification Area (reference PR/04354/WSANA) which relates to the medieval hamlet of Turners Hill.

Policy DP34 of the District Plan is relevant in this respect and states in part that *'the Council will seek to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the character and quality of life of the District.'*

Significance can be defined as the special interest of a heritage asset, which may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic.'

As the proposed building works are relatively modest in scale, with the rear extension replacing an existing structure, it is not considered that the proposal would have an adverse impact on this heritage asset, however a condition can be attached to any consent to ensure that if any historic artefacts are discovered, appropriate action would be undertaken.

The proposal therefore accords with policy DP34 of the District Plan.

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 proposed extensions are deemed acceptable in terms of design, form and scale to the existing dwellinghouse and surrounding properties and should preserve the appearance and character of the conservation area. Taking into account the existing relationship between properties, it is not considered that the development would cause significant harm in terms of affecting privacy, light levels or outlook.

The proposal therefore accords with policies DP26, DP34 and DP35 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policy THP7 of the Turners Hill Neighbourhood Plan and relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Catherine Cardin