

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/0779	Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Construction of a new wraparound single storey extension. Insertion of one new window and blocking up of one in the existing house. Construction of decked terrace for access to the garden.		
Site:	104 Junction Road, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 0JZ, , , ,		
Validation Date	24 Mar 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	17 Apr 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	15 May 2025
Target Date:	19 May 2025	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:	15 May 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/0779

**104 Junction Road, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 0JZ, , ,
Construction of a new wraparound single storey extension. Insertion of one new window and blocking up of one in the existing house. Construction of decked terrace for access to the garden.**

Mr Ian Greed

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

There were no letters of representation received in response to the current proposal.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

None received.

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Town Council: Recommended approval. The committee expressed concern that the plans are not accurate regarding the exact location of the decked terrace.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for the development of a single storey rear wraparound extension. A new window would be added to the dwellings side elevation and an existing side window would be blocked up. A decked terrace area would also be constructed as part of the development proposal.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/25/0871 - Proposed new L-shaped dormer. Pending consideration (at time of writing)

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application relates to 104 Junction Road, a two storey dwelling which forms one half of a pair of semis and is set to the eastern side of the highway. The property is set back from the highway edge by a front driveway and garden space and is afforded ample garden amenity space to the rear which stretches back in a linear plot format. The existing dwelling follows an L shaped form, with a two storey gabled projection to the rear which is shared with the adjoining semi. In terms of external materials, the existing dwelling is composed of brown brickwork with red brick detailing to the external walls, a tiled roof and white uPVC windows.

With regard to the sites locality, the property is positioned within the context of a cluster of four residential dwellings, with the neighbouring semi to the south displaying a comparable brick exterior and design to the application site.

The site is within the built-up area for Burgess Hill as defined in the District Plan (DP).

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposed development would develop a new rear (south-eastern) and side (north-eastern) elevation wraparound extension. The extension would have a maximum length of approximately 8.3m, a maximum width of 5.5m and a height of 3.3m when taken from the highest point of the natural ground floor level. The proposed wrap around extension would feature a side elevation brick wall and brown wood effect

vertical cladding to the rear elevation, glass reinforced plaster roof and a stone/ concrete coping to the top of the parapet, black metal side elevation and white reused uPVC windows and white uPVC side and black metal rear doors.

A new rear (south-eastern) decked terrace would also be constructed as part of the development proposal which would measure at circa 3.6m in length and 6.9m in width. The decked area would be constructed of grey composite wood effect decking.

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

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

Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan (Made January 2016)

Relevant Policies:

None relevant

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 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

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)

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

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
- 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'*

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.'

With regard to rear extensions, Principle DG51 of the Design Guide states:

'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.'

Principle DG50 of the Design Guide provides some further guidance on what constitutes good design with regard 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.'

It is considered that the proposed wrap around side and rear extension would be set within a visually discrete position with regard to the street scene. Furthermore, the adjoining semi to the south has an existing single storey wrap around extension which would likely be mirrored in form through the current application, albeit utilising an alternative roof pitch. The proposed single storey size and scale of the proposal is considered to appear subservient towards the existing dwelling and the use of matching brickwork would in part help the extensions assimilate into the existing.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy DP26 of the District 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);'*

An existing second floor window would be blocked up as part of the development proposal with a new opening at ground floor level created to the existing dwellings side (north-eastern) elevation, serving a studio room. Furthermore, an additional window opening would be created to the same elevation but serving the proposed extension and would serve a kitchen area. It is considered that these windows would be positioned to a low level with their level of outlook restricted by an existing boundary hedge. Views would likely be more prominent during the winter months whilst foliage is sparse and the proposed kitchen window to the side extension would likely face directly towards the adjacent neighbouring window at 106a at ground floor level which is unobscured glazed. A condition ensuring that the proposed side (north-eastern) elevation kitchen window remains obscure glazed in perpetuity is considered relevant and necessary in the instance that planning permission is granted in the interest of neighbouring amenity.

In terms of light impact to the rear windows, 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 proposal would be of a limited single storey size and scale and would be offset by approximately 1.3m from the shared boundary to the north with 106a. When assessed against the 25 degree test, the neighbouring ground floor windows which would face towards the extension would pass. As such, it is not considered that the proposed extension would result in a significant overbearing impact towards the neighbouring sites.

The proposed area of flat roof could be accessed through bedroom 3 and therefore used as a balcony space. This would likely give rise to an adverse impact in terms of overlooking towards the neighbouring occupiers. As such, a condition restricting the flat roofs use as a balcony is considered relevant and necessary in the case that permission is granted.

The proposed decking area would be slightly raised above the natural ground floor level and therefore offer a greater degree of outlook towards the adjacent neighbouring sites. It is considered that the adjoining neighbouring semi also utilises a rear raised terrace and the level of outlook from this area would result in an adverse impact towards the privacy of adjacent sites.

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

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 and will not negatively impact on the host dwelling nor its immediate setting and will not harm neighbouring amenities.

The proposal will comply with Policy DP26 of the District Plan, the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan, the MSDC Design Guide and the requirements of the NPPF.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Stefan Galyas