

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/1955	Case Officer:	Deborah Lynn
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Single storey rear extension. New porch to front replacing existing.		
Site:	4 Oak Hall Park, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 0BX, , , ,		
Validation Date	6 Aug 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	23 Sep 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	8 Oct 2026
Target Date:	1 Oct 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Deborah Lynn

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Steven King	Date:	9 Oct 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/1955

**4 Oak Hall Park, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 0BX, , ,
Single storey rear extension. New porch to front replacing existing.
Mr And Mrs P Herve**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

MSDC Flood Risk and Drainage

No objection, add informative.

MSDC Trees

No objection, subject to condition.

Southern Water

General guidance given.

BURGESS HILL TOWN COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

The Committee of 14th September had a similar view to when this was previously discussed on 24th August and would Recommend Approval.

INTRODUCTION

This application seeks planning permission for a single storey rear extension and a new porch to the front to replace existing.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

There are no relevant applications.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

No. 4 Oak Hall Park is a detached 1970s house located within a row of similar properties. The property benefits from an attached single garage, set back to the eastern side of the dwellinghouse with driveway to the front. Land levels decline from east to west and from south to north.

In terms of planning policy, the site lies within the built up area of Burgess Hill,

APPLICATION DETAILS

Plans show that the existing flat roof porch to the front of the dwellinghouse will be replaced with a similar porch that measures approximately 4.65 metres wide by 3.15 metres high and 1.7 metres deep. The replacement porch will have a flat roof and will be finished with facing brickwork and white / off white painted render walls with full height glazing and a tall fascia.

A single storey extension is also proposed to the rear of the dwellinghouse and garage, projecting between 3.05 and 4.6 metres from the rear wall and measuring 9 metres wide by 3.15 metres high with a flat roof. The walls of the extension will be finished with facing brickwork and white / off white painted render, with 3 pairs of glazed sliding doors to the rear walls. Two no. roof lights are also proposed to the roof.

Plans indicate that the ground floor layout of the dwellinghouse will be reconfigured with the existing wc extended to a shower room, the kitchen converted to a utility room, with a new enlarged kitchen / dining / sitting room created to the rear. A home office is proposed in the extension to the rear of the garage. Plans also indicate that a ground floor window will be installed in the eastern side wall of the house, to serve the shower 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, Site Allocation Development Plan Document (DPD) and the Burgess 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
DP37 trees, woodland and hedgerows
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.

Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Plan was made on the 28th January 2016.

There are no policies deemed relevant to this application.

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 is currently at Examination with initial hearings held in February/March 2026. The Council has consulted on Main Modifications which are required to ensure the plan is legally compliant and sound with further Hearings taking place in November 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
DPS4 flood risk and drainage
DPS6 health and wellbeing
DPN4 trees, woodland and hedgerows
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) (August 2026)

ASSESSMENT

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

- Design and impact on character of area
- Impact on neighbouring amenities
- Impact on trees
- Flood risk and drainage.

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. However, this policy has very limited weight as it is materially inconsistent with the NPPF, and greater weight should be given to Policy DP3 of the NPPF.

Policy DP3 of the NPPF sets out the key principles for well-designed places. This sets out in part that proposals should respond to their context, so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets.

The Council's adopted Design Guide is a material consideration in the determination of the application. Chapter 9 of the Design Guide relates to household extensions. Design Principle DG49 states 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 front extensions and advises that 'where front extensions are considered acceptable, they should normally be limited to a modest single storey or porch-type extension that reflect the character of the existing property.'

DG51 relates specifically to rear extensions and states that rear extensions that are not visible from the street and do not negatively impact on neighbouring properties can be expressed in many forms but should consider the character of the existing building and the relationship to adjacent buildings and gardens.

The proposed replacement porch is similar in form and scale to the existing porch, although it is shown to be approximately 0.7 metres higher. The dwellinghouse lies within a row of similar properties that have front ground floor projections with flat roofs. The proposed design and form of the porch is therefore considered in keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposed

white / off white painted render represents a new external material on the building, however it is not considered that this would appear out of keeping as white weatherboarding is present on several properties within the locality.

The proposed rear extension is considered acceptable in terms of design, form and scale to the existing dwellinghouse and surrounding properties and is considered to have limited visibility within the locality, although plans indicate that it will protrude above the roof of the existing garage.

Overall, the proposed development is deemed in keeping and should not detract from the appearance and character of the area, thereby according with policy DP26 of the District Plan and policy DP3 of the NPPF.

Impact on 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. It is considered that this policy has very limited weight as it is materially inconsistent with the NPPF and consideration should be given to policies L2 and P3 of the NPPF.

Policy L2 of the NPPF relates to making effective use of land. Part L2: 1.d. ii requires proposals to have *'acceptable living standards for residents and neighbours in terms of access to daylight, sunlight, privacy and external amenity space.'*

Policy P3 of the NPPF relates to living conditions and pollution. Part P3: 2.b of this policy requires proposals to *'not give rise to, or contribute to, an unacceptable level of access to daylight and sunlight for neighbouring residents and occupiers, or unacceptable levels of air, noise, artificial light, water, soil or other forms of pollution on or beyond the site'.*

The proposed rear extension would be sited to the north of the dwellinghouse at no. 4 and would be sited at a lower level to the dwellinghouse at no. 2 Oak Hall Park and a high level to the dwellinghouse at no. 6.

Having regard to the position of the extension in relation to neighbouring properties, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact upon neighbours in terms of accessing sunlight and daylight. Nor should the proposal restrict outlook or impede privacy.

A ground floor window is proposed to the eastern elevation of the existing dwellinghouse. This is something that could be installed under permitted development rights and is not considered to have an adverse impact upon adjoining privacy in terms of creating overlooking.

In view of the above, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact upon neighbouring amenities, thereby according with policy DP26 of the District Plan and policies L2 and P3 of the NPPF.

Flood Risk and Drainage

District Plan policy DP41 relates to flood risk and requires that development proposals seek to reduce the risk of flooding. However this policy carries very limited weight as it is materially inconsistent with the NPPF.

Section 18 of the NPPF concerns managing flood risk and coastal change, with policy F7 requiring that *'development proposals should not present a risk from flooding to potential occupiers, users, or visitors, and should not increase flood risk elsewhere.'*

The site lies within flood zone 1 with a very low risk of fluvial flooding and also lies within an area of very low surface water flood risk.

The Council's Flood Risk and Drainage Team has been consulted on the proposal and has raised no objection on flood risk grounds, however has recommended that an informative is attached to the decision notice.

In view of this, the proposal is deemed acceptable from a drainage and flood risk perspective, thereby according with policy DP41 of the District Plan and policy F7 of the NPPF.

Impact on trees

Policy DP37 of the District Plan supports the protection and enhancement of trees, woodland and hedgerows and encourages new planting. However this is attributed very limited weight as it is materially inconsistent with the NPPF, with greater weight given to NPPF policy N2 which states that proposals should:

'd. Conserve and enhance existing natural features of visual, historic or nature conservation value (such as established trees and hedgerows) where possible; and use appropriate landscaping to help create a well-designed place and integrate the development into its surroundings;'

An Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan have been submitted with the application. These detail that an existing Korean privet shrub next to the patio will be removed to accommodate an extension. All other shrubs and trees, including a category C Cherry Plum tree should not be impacted by the proposal and will be enclosed by protective barriers during construction works.

The Council's Tree Officer has been consulted on the proposal and has raised no objection subject to the development being carried out in accordance with the tree reports.

The proposed development is therefore deemed acceptable from an arboricultural perspective, thereby according with policy DP37 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and policy N2 of 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

The proposed development is deemed acceptable in terms of design, form and scale to the existing dwellinghouse and surrounding properties and should not detract from the character and appearance of the area. Nor should the proposal adversely affect nearby trees. The proposal therefore accords with policies DP26, DP37 and DP41 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and relevant policies of the NPPF.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Deborah Lynn