

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/0872	Case Officer:	Katherine Williams
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed second storey side extension, replacement of front garden hedge with new boundary wall and realignment of rear/south-east corner boundary fence		
Site:	36 Mayhouse Road, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 9RF, , , ,		
Validation Date	31 Mar 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	25 Apr 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	23 May 2025
Target Date:	26 May 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	Katherine Williams

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	23 May 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/0872

**36 Mayhouse Road, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 9RF, , ,
Proposed second storey side extension, replacement of front garden hedge with new boundary wall and realignment of rear/south-east corner boundary fence
Mr C Terry**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Flood Risk and Drainage Team - no objection.

TOWN COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Recommend Approval.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for a two storey side extension, replacement of front garden hedge with new boundary wall and realignment of rear/south-east corner boundary fence.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposed side extension would result in the demolition of part of the existing garage and the construction of a two storey side extension. The extension would have a width to match the existing garage projection and would be set back from the front elevation by some 0.2 metres. The extension at first floor would extend over the retained ground floor utility room with an overall depth of approximately 7.6 metres. The extension would have a pitched hipped roof with an eaves height to match the existing dwelling and an overall height of some 7.5 metres and would be constructed in materials to match the existing dwelling.

The existing front and side boundary hedge of the property would be replaced by a boundary wall. This wall would be constructed in brick up to 0.6 metres with brick pillars and black metal railings in between with an overall height of 1.2 metres.

The boundary fence along the eastern side of the rear garden of the property would be relocated to run parallel with the adjacent footpath, and thereby enlarging the rear garden.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application property is a detached two storey dwelling located on the southern side of Mayhouse Road, within the built up area of Burgess Hill.

The locality is characterised by a residential development consisting of dwellings of varying designs and forms but with an overarching style. The properties benefit from off street parking and soft landscaping with the front gardens and boundaries defined by hedging and fencing with some examples of brick walls.

The application property is positioned on the western side of the junction between Mayhouse Road and Elwood Close, which gives wider views of the property and is located within a prominent position in the streetscene. The dwelling has a pitched hipped roof with a central front gable projection, the dwelling also benefits from side and rear single storey projections. The dwelling is constructed in brick, portion of hanging tiles, interlocking roof tiles and white fenestration

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 DPD and 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
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.

Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan (made January 2016)

Policy S4 - Parking Standards for New Developments

Other Material Considerations

Mid Sussex District Plan 2021-2039 Consultation Draft

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) was published for public consultation on 12th January 2024 for six weeks and as a result of this consultation there are unresolved objections to some of the Policies in the draft District Plan. 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
DPS4 - Flood Risk and Drainage
DPB1 - Character and Design
DPT4 - Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure

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 2023)

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 properties
- Impact on parking provision
- Biodiversity Net Gain
- Other Matters

Design and Character

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex 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:

- *is of high quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace;*
- *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;*
- *creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape;*
- *protects open spaces, trees and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;*
- *protects valued townscapes and the separate identity and character of towns and villages;*
- *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 DP27);*
- *creates a pedestrian-friendly layout that is safe, well connected, legible and accessible;*
- *incorporates well integrated parking that does not dominate the street environment, particularly where high density housing is proposed;*
- *positively addresses sustainability considerations in the layout and the building design;*
- *take the opportunity to encourage community interaction by creating layouts with a strong neighbourhood focus/centre; larger (300+ unit) schemes will also normally be expected to incorporate a mixed use element;*
- *optimises the potential of the site to accommodate development."*

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.'

Principle DG50 relates to side extensions and states:

'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. The gaps between dwellings can sometimes positively contribute to articulating (for example, through the consistent rhythm of repeated houses) and adding interest in a street frontage or by providing views / visible connections to the surrounding countryside. Side extensions will therefore need to appropriately respond to the character of the street form and will not normally be accepted where they close an important gap and view.'

The proposal is considered to be of a design and form which would reflect the appearance and proportions of the existing property. The side extension would be visible from the streetscene and would be of a design which would be visually subservient to the original dwelling with the ridge height sent down and the front elevation set back from the original dwelling. The proposed boundary wall around the front garden of the property would change the appearance of the property within the streetscene, however due to its low overall height and perforated and open appearance it is not considered that this boundary treatment would have a detrimental impact on the character of the streetscene or the locality. The repositioning of the side boundary fence would marginally enlarge the rear garden of the property and bring the existing boundary fence closer to the footpath. Given the scale of the increase and that the existing boundary consists of close boarded fencing it is considered that the works would be in keeping with the character of the area.

Impact on neighbouring properties

DP26 states:

'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);'

To the western side is No. 37 Mayhouse Road, the proposed side extension would be adjacent to this neighbouring property. The extension would marginally extend beyond the existing ground floor rear elevation of this neighbour, with the first floor set away. Given the relationship between the properties it is considered that the proposal would not cause significant harm to the amenities of this neighbour.

To the rear of the property is No. 24 Elwood Close, which has its side elevation facing onto the application property. The proposed extension to the dwellinghouse would not extend beyond the existing first floor rear elevation of the dwelling and therefore not considered to have a greater impact on the amenities of this neighbour than the existing dwelling. The proposed relocation of the boundary fence would be located adjacent to the boundary with this neighbour, however given the orientation of this neighbour it is considered that the works would not cause harm to the amenities of this neighbour.

Impact on the parking provision for the property

Policy S4 of the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan in part states:

'In cases where planning permission is necessary for alterations and extensions to properties support will not be given for the conversion of garage space to habitable rooms/ residential use unless there is adequate space to park cars off street in line with the parking standards.'

'Design and layout of off-site parking areas, on street parking areas, garage/parking blocks will be designed to allow ease of access from driveways and accessibility to parking areas without causing obstruction.'

Appendix D of the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan sets out that 4 bedroom dwellings located outside the defined Town Centre area are required to provide 2 designated spaces and 1 non-designated space per 2 dwellings. West Sussex County Council September 2020 Parking Standards Guidance, outlines that for a 4 bedroom dwelling in this location 2.5 parking spaces have to be provided.

The proposal would result in the loss of the existing garage of the property, with the 2 No. parking spaces retained on the driveway. There are no on street parking restrictions in the locality, and although

the parking provision of the property would not meet the WSCC guidance the short fall is not considered to warrant the refusal of the application.

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.

Other Matters

The Council's Flood Risk and Drainage Team have been consulted on the application and raises no objection on flood risk grounds and drainage matters can be managed under building regulations.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the proposal is considered to be appropriate in terms of the character of the streetscene and the locality, would not cause harm the amenities of neighbouring properties and acceptable in terms of the impact on parking. Therefore, the proposal complies with Mid Sussex District Plan policies DP21 and DP26, and with the relevant provisions of the NPPF. The application therefore accords with the Development Plan and is considered acceptable.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Katherine Williams