

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/1327	Case Officer:	Deborah Lynn
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Part single storey and part two storey rear extension		
Site:	39 Ockley Way, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 8NE, , , ,		
Validation Date	28 May 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	25 Jun 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	22 Jul 2026
Target Date:	23 Jul 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Deborah Lynn

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	2
--	--	-------------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	23 Jul 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/1327

**39 Ockley Way, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 8NE, , ,
Part single storey and part two storey rear extension
Mr J Smyth**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

Comments have been received from the neighbour at no. 4 Farnham Avenue, raising the following concerns:

- Object due to significant, negative impact two storey extension will have on privacy and amenity.
- By extending 4 metres into rear garden, first floor window is 5 metres from shared boundary - this is substantial departure from standard 10 to 11 metre separation distance required by local policy.
- As new master bedroom is a primary habitable room, placing a large window close to boundary creates a perched vantage point.
- Will provide an intrusive line of sight that looks directly down into private garden, stripping away privacy.
- Ground floor bi-fold doors will create fishbowl effect, providing wide field of view that will leave neighbours feeling exposed.
- Would be open to compromise and withdraw objection if first floor window were replaced with a high-level window, an oriel window or privacy louvres and screening on shared boundary were enhanced, such as increasing height of close boarded fence.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

None.

HASSOCKS PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

The committee recommend that permission is granted.

INTRODUCTION

This application seeks planning permission for a part single storey, part two storey rear extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

There are no previous applications deemed relevant.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

No. 39 Ockley Way is a semi-detached 1960s house located within a row of similar properties. The dwellinghouse faces east and benefits from an attached single garage set back to the side, with off road parking to the front for 2 cars. A private garden is located to the rear (west), backing onto residential properties in Farnham Avenue; a contemporary style outbuilding has been erected to the rear of the garage.

In terms of planning policy, the site lies within the built up area of Hassocks. It also lies within a Great Crested Newt red impact risk zone.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Plans show that a part two storey, part single storey extension is proposed to the rear of the dwellinghouse.

The two storey part of the rear extension is shown to measure approximately 4.3 metres deep by 4.7 metres wide and 6.55 metres high, with a hipped roof proposed. The ground floor extension will span the width of the property, infilling between the proposed two storey addition and neighbouring property at no. 40 Ockley Way. This element of the proposal will measure approximately 2.25 metres wide by 4.3 metres deep and 3.3 metres high with a mono-pitched roof and roof light that face south. A parapet wall measuring approximately 2.85 metres high is proposed upon the boundary with no. 40.

The external walls of the extension will be finished with facing brickwork, with tile hanging proposed at first floor level and a plain tiled roof. White upvc windows are proposed; a set of 3 glazed bi-fold doors are proposed to the rear elevation at ground level.

The extension will provide an enlarged kitchen / family area and a master bedroom at first floor level, with an existing bedroom converted to form a small office.

In addition to the above, plans show that a first floor window is proposed to the existing flank wall of the dwellinghouse, to serve the proposed office.

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 Hassocks 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

DP39 sustainable design and construction.

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.

Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Plan was made on the 24th June 2020.

Relevant policies:

5 enabling carbon zero

9 character and design

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

DPS6 health and wellbeing

DPB1 character and design

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

The main issues deemed relevant to the consideration of this application are:

- Design and impact on character of area
- Impact on neighbouring amenities
- Sustainability.

Design and impact on character of area

Policy DP26 of the District Plan relates to character and design and requires all proposals, including alterations and extensions, 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.

Policy 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan relates to character and design and follows a similar stance to the District Plan, whilst requiring proposals to have regard to the Hassocks Townscape Appraisal.

The Council's Design Guide SPD is also a material planning consideration with design principles DG49 and DG51 deemed relevant to this application.

Principle DG49 relates to general principles for extensions and recommends that *'extensions should typically use simple, uncomplicated building forms to complement 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.'*

DG51 relates specifically to rear extensions and states the following:

'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 proposed extension is considered acceptable in terms of design, form and scale to the existing dwellinghouse and surrounding properties. Plans show that the extension will sit subserviently against the rear elevation of the existing dwellinghouse, with proposed external materials to match. The two storey rear extension is reflective of an adjoining extension to the rear of no. 38 Ockley Way, albeit the proposal is considered more in keeping, with a hipped roof proposed in place of a flat roof.

The two storey rear extension would be visible in views from Manor Avenue to the south, however by reason of its scale, form and proposed materials, is not considered to detract from the character and appearance of the area.

The proposal therefore accords with policy DP26 of the District Plan and policy 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Impact on amenity

Policy DP26 of the District Plan refers to amenity and states in part 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 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan states in part that proposals should *'not cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings, including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight, sunlight and security.'*

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. As the Neighbourhood Plan was adopted at a later date to the District Plan, policy 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan is considered to take precedence and therefore the test in this instance is whether the development would cause unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenities as outlined above.

It is noted that a conservatory immediately adjoins the site at 40 Ockley Way to the south, although this has not been shown on the block plan submitted. As the proposed extensions would be sited to the north of the attached dwellinghouse at no. 40, it is not considered that the proposal should significantly impact light levels to the property; nor is the proposal considered to impact outlook or privacy, or appear overbearing as to have an unacceptable impact.

To the north, a two storey flat roof extension has been added to the rear of no. 38 Ockley Way; a first floor window has been installed in the southern flank wall of the original dwellinghouse, adjacent to the rear extension. The house at no. 38 lies just over 7.5 metres from the northern flank wall of no. 39 with garages situated between. Given the distance between properties, it is not considered that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact upon adjoining amenities at no. 38 in terms of affecting light levels, outlook, or appearing imposing. Amended plans have been provided to show that the proposed first floor office window to the northern flank wall of no. 39 will be obscure glazed, with just the fan light openable, thereby ensuring that the window does not cause undue overlooking into the first floor window at no. 38.

The neighbouring property at no. 4 Farham Avenue adjoins the site to the west, with the rear gardens of the properties backing on to one another. The resident at no. 4 has raised concerns that the proposed extension, particularly the first floor extension, saying that in their view, it would have a significant negative impact upon their property, appearing intrusive and causing overlooking onto the rear garden, thereby reducing privacy.

At present, the rear wall of no. 39 Ockley Way lies approximately 11.4 metres from the rear boundary of the property. The proposed extension would reduce the distance to approximately 7.1 metres. There is no standard or policy requirement regarding how far a dwellinghouse should be sited from its rear boundary although there is a general planning rule for back to back development which recommends

there is a distance of at least 21 metres where first floor windows of separate properties face one another.

The rear garden at no. 4 Farnham Avenue is long, measuring over 30 metres in length from the original rear wall of the house. As such, any overlooking onto the property from no. 39 would mainly be concentrated towards the eastern end of the garden. The Planning Officer has visited the property and rear garden at no. 4, however being July, was unable to clearly see the existing rear elevation of the house at no. 39 due to established trees and vegetation lining the rear boundary of the property. Whilst it is likely that the vegetation / tree screening would be sparser during winter months, or could be lost or removed at some future point, given the distance between dwellinghouses and the length of the rear garden at no. 4 Farnham Avenue, it is not considered that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact in terms of creating overlooking onto the property or reducing privacy as to warrant refusal of the application. The proposed relationship between properties would be similar to that between no. 38 Ockley Way and no. 6 Farnham Avenue, albeit the proposed two storey extension at no. 39 would be sited closer to the rear boundary of the property than that at no. 38 which lies approximately 8.6 metres from the boundary. Notwithstanding this, it is not considered necessary to require high level windows, oriel windows or louvres to be installed in place of the first floor window, or condition that additional screening is required.

In view of the above, whilst the proposal would be likely to impact neighbouring amenities, it is not considered that such impact would be unacceptable as to warrant refusal of the application.

The proposal therefore accords with policy 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Sustainability

Policy 5 of the Neighbourhood Plan requires residential developments, including extensions, to *'maximise the inclusion of energy-saving measures and renewable energy generation.'*

Policy DP39 of the District Plan supports proposals that seek to improve the sustainability of development and maximise energy use.

The planning agent for the application has provided a sustainability and energy efficiency statement advising that the extension will be constructed in accordance with current building regulations, with new walls, floors and roofs incorporating high levels of insulation, together with energy-efficient glazing, insulated external doors, appropriate airtightness measures and careful detailing to reduce thermal bridging and heat loss. Further energy saving measures are also proposed.

In view of the above, the proposal is considered to comply with policy 5 of the Neighbourhood Plan and policy DP39 of the District Plan.

Great Crested Newts

The site lies within a designated Great Crested Newt Red Impact Risk Zone which indicates that there is a high risk of Great Crested Newts on the site. Having regard to the residential nature of the proposal and scale of the development, it is not considered that the proposal would have any impact upon newts or their habitat. However, an informative can be attached to the planning consent to advise the applicant on action to be taken should Great Crested Newts be found during construction works.

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 development is deemed in keeping with the character of the existing dwellinghouse in terms of design, form and scale and should not detract from the character and appearance of the area. Whilst the proposal is likely to impact neighbouring amenities, it is not considered that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm in this respect. The proposal therefore accords with policies DP26 and DP39 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and policies 5 and 9 of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Deborah Lynn