

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/0279	Case Officer:	Deborah Lynn
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Removal of garage, outbuilding and conservatory and erection of part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension.		
Site:	Hillview, 8A Slimbridge Road, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 8QE, , ,		
Validation Date	11 Feb 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	20 Mar 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	22 Apr 2026
Target Date:	8 Apr 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Deborah Lynn

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Joanne Fisher	Date:	23 Apr 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/0279

**Hillview, 8A Slimbridge Road, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 8QE, ,
Removal of garage, outbuilding and conservatory and erection of part two storey, part single
storey side and rear extension.
Matthew Da Silva**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

MSDC Conservation Officer

The proposal is considered, on balance, to preserve the character and appearance of the Fairfield Conservation Area.

MSDC Flood Risk and Drainage

We have no objection to the proposed development on flood risk grounds.

Southern Water

No objections to the proposal.

BURGESS HILL TOWN COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

The Committee of 9th March would Recommend Approval, whilst regretting the loss of a garage.

INTRODUCTION

This application seeks planning permission for the removal of the garage, outbuilding and conservatory and the erection of a part two storey, part single storey side and rear extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

BH/007/74 - Single-storey rear extension. Permission granted 14.02.1974.

BH/286/98 - Addition of a conservatory extension at the rear of the house. Total area of extension 7.3sq m. Permission granted 26.01.1999.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Hillview is a detached 1950s house with detached single garage set back to its eastern side, located on the northern side of Slimbridge Road. The property benefits from a generous sized garden to the rear with off road parking to the front and side of the dwellinghouse.

Slimbridge Road has a mixed street scene with residential properties of varying styles and type. A terrace of Victorian / Edwardian houses adjoins the site to the west, whilst a detached period house adjoins the site to the east with a terrace of period dwellings beyond. Bungalows lie opposite the site to the south.

In terms of planning policy, the property lies within the built up area of Burgess Hill and Fairfield Conservation Area. The site also lies within an area at risk of surface water flooding.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Proposed plans show that the existing garage, outbuilding and conservatory will be removed and replaced with a two storey side and rear extension and single storey rear extension.

The proposed two storey side extension will be set back approximately 2.5 metres from the front wall of the dwellinghouse and will extend 2.8 metres beyond the eastern flank wall of the house, leaving a 1.16

metre gap between the extension and the eastern boundary of the property with Southdene. The side extension will measure 6.43 metres deep and will measure 6.65 metres wide to the rear, wrapping around the rear elevation of the dwellinghouse and extending 3.5 metres beyond the original rear wall of the dwelling. A hipped roof is proposed to the extension which matches the eaves height and ridge height of the existing roof.

The proposed single storey rear extension is shown to project a further 1.5 metres beyond the proposed two storey side and rear extension and will span the width of the dwellinghouse, measuring 10.16 metres wide and projecting a maximum depth of 5 metres from the original wall of the house at its western end. The single storey extension will have a flat roof that measures 2.8 metres high with a roof light proposed to the western side of the extension that protrudes 200 mm above the flat roof.

The extensions will be finished with facing brickwork and a tiled roof to match the existing dwellinghouse, with white upvc windows and doors proposed.

The proposed extensions will allow an open plan kitchen / dining room / family room to be created to the rear of the dwellinghouse with a utility, wc and study also proposed at ground level. At first floor level, an existing bedroom will be converted to form a bathroom with 2 no. bedrooms proposed plus an ensuite shower.

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:

DP21 - Transport

DP26 - Character and Design

DP35 - Conservation Areas

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

Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan was made on the 28th January 2016.

Relevant policy:

H1 - Protection and enhancing heritage assets and conservation areas

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

DPS4 - Flood Risk and Drainage

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)

202. Heritage assets range from sites and buildings of local historic value to those of the highest significance, such as World Heritage Sites which are internationally recognised to be of Outstanding Universal Value. These assets are an irreplaceable resource, and should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of existing and future generations.

210. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness

212. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

213. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.

Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional⁷⁵.

214. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

215. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

219. Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites, and within the setting of heritage assets, to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to the asset (or which better reveal its significance) should be treated favourably.

ASSESSMENT

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

- Design and impact on character of area, including conservation area
- Impact on neighbouring amenities
- Parking provision
- 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 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.

The Council's adopted Design Guide SPD is also a material planning consideration with design principles DG49, DG50 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.'*

DG50 relates to front and 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 specifically 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.'*

As the site lies within Fairfield Conservation Area, section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that:

'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 and policy H1 of the Neighbourhood Plan which require development proposals in Conservation Areas to preserve or enhance their special character and appearance. Policy DP35 elaborates that extensions should be sensitively designed to reflect the special characteristics of the area in terms of their scale, density, design and through the use of complementary materials, amongst other criteria.

The Council's Conservation Officer has provided detailed comments on the proposal and notes that the demolition of the existing garage and conservatory is not considered contentious in principle. However, she notes that the proposed extensions are substantial in size and might be considered inappropriate in their relationship of scale with the host dwelling, particularly as they wrap around the northeastern corner of the dwellinghouse which is generally discouraged by design principle DG49 of the Design Guide, which under figure 9E, advises that this can undermine the integrity of the original architecture.

Despite this, the size and scale of the proposed additions as shown on the proposed block plan are considered appropriate to the existing dwellinghouse and surrounding properties, with the Conservation Officer noting that the extended property would not appear overscaled in the context of the mixed development along Slimbridge Road and that on balance, with the proposed additions well set back from the front elevation of the house, that an objection to the scale and form of the additions on grounds of impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area could not be substantiated.

The design and form of the two storey extension is reflective of the existing dwellinghouse and is not considered to detract from its character and appearance or the streetscene. Whilst the proposed side extension would close an existing gap within the street scene which allow views to the north between Hillview and Southdene, this aspect of the proposal is not considered contentious.

In view of the above, the proposed development is considered 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, thereby preserving the character and appearance of Fairfield conservation area. The proposal therefore accords with policies DP26 and DP35 of the District Plan and policy H1 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Impact on neighbouring amenities

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*'.

The neighbouring dwellinghouse at Southdene lies to the east of the application site and the proposed two storey side and rear extension. The dwellinghouse has previously been extended on its western side with a ground floor addition that forms a garage, with family room / den to the rear that is served by roof lights in a mono-pitched roof. At first floor level, a window and 2 no. high level obscure glazed windows are located in the western flank wall of the dwellinghouse.

Whilst the proposed side extension is likely to impact light levels and outlook to the adjoining first floor window at Southdene, as the extension will be set back 2.5 metres from the front wall of the dwellinghouse, it is not considered that such impact would be significantly harmful as to warrant refusal of the application. Likewise, any impact upon the adjoining high level windows is not considered to be significant considering the modest and obscure glazed nature of the windows. As the rooflights serving the family room / den face upwards towards the sky, these should still benefit from good natural light levels during the day.

No. 8 Slimbridge Road, a period end of terrace dwellinghouse, lies to the west of the application site. This has been extended to the rear with a single storey extension and benefits from 2 no. small ground floor windows located in the original eastern flank wall of the dwellinghouse.

The proposed single storey rear extension is likely to impact light levels and outlook to the windows which the applicant advises serve a dining room, which is also served by large French doors that lead to the rear extension.

The proposed extension is shown to measure 5 metres deep by 2.8 metres high, with an overall height of 3 metres including the proposed roof light. The fallback position is that a single storey rear extension up to 4 metres deep, with an eaves height of 3 metres and overall height of 4 metres could be installed under permitted development rights, adjacent to the dwellinghouse at no. 8.

Considering the modest size of the windows, it is not considered that the proposal would be likely to cause significant harm to neighbouring amenities in terms of restricting light levels or outlook. Notwithstanding this, when considering the fallback position and what could be added under permitted development rights, it is not considered that the local planning authority could raise an objection to any potential impact upon the adjoining windows / room on amenity grounds.

The proposed development is therefore deemed acceptable in that it should not cause significant harm to neighbouring amenities in terms of affecting light levels, outlook or privacy. The proposal therefore accords with policy DP26 of the District Plan.

Parking Provision

Policy DP21 of the District Plan relates to Transport and states in part that development proposals should provide *'adequate car parking for the 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.'*

The proposed development would result in the loss of a garage parking space, however one off road parking space would remain to the front of the garage with an additional parking space to the front of the dwellinghouse.

The West Sussex County Council Car Parking Demand Calculator recommends that a dwelling with 4 bedrooms in this location has 3 off road parking spaces. Whilst the proposal would not meet this requirement, with 2 off road parking spaces remaining, it is not considered that the proposal would be detrimental to highway safety in terms of generating additional off street parking.

The proposal is therefore considered to accord with policy DP21 of the District Plan.

Flood Risk and Drainage

District Plan policy DP41 relates to flood risk and states in part that:

'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.'

Mapping records indicate that the property lies within Flood Zone 1 and an area at very low to low risk of surface water flooding.

The Council's Flood Risk and Drainage Team has raised no objection to the proposed development on flood risk grounds, however has recommended that the applicant consider resistance and resilience measures suggested within the Environment Agency standing advice. An informative can be added to the decision notice in this respect.

Southern Water has also raised no objections to the application.

The proposal is therefore deemed acceptable from a flood risk and drainage perspective thereby complying with policy DP41 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 considered acceptable in terms of design, form and scale to the existing dwellinghouse and surrounding properties such that they should not detract from the character of the area, thereby preserving the character and appearance of Fairfield conservation area. Nor should the proposal cause significant harm to neighbouring amenities in terms of affecting light levels, outlook or privacy. The proposal therefore accords with policies DP21, DP26 and DP35 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and policy H1 of the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Deborah Lynn

