

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/24/3006	Case Officer:	Andrew Watt
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed single and two storey side extensions and garage with hobby space above		
Site:	Braeside, Furzefield Road, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 2EF, , ,		
Validation Date	13 Mar 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	4 Apr 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	23 May 2025
Target Date:	8 May 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	Andrew Watt

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Steven King	Date:	23 May 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/24/3006

**Braeside, Furzefield Road, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 2EF, ,
Proposed single and two storey side extensions and garage with hobby space above
Ms Hannah Searle**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

2 letters of objection to original proposal (from same address):

- Object, specifically in relation to the proposed triple garage with hobby room above
- Loss of privacy from dormer windows, approx. 12m from rear of our property
- Size and scale of the proposed building, combined with its proximity to our boundary, would create a dominant and overbearing presence
- Reduced sense of openness in our garden
- Concerns regarding potential future use and intensification of the site
- Support the proposed plans to improve Braeside itself
- Request removal or repositioning of the dormer windows to prevent overlooking
- Request restrictions on the use of the hobby room to prevent future conversion into habitable accommodation

No comments received on amended plans.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Southern Water

Southern Water has determined the Flow rate for the above site will remain consistent, so capacity is not an issue and no Southern Water assets will be affected. Therefore, Southern Water has no objections to this proposal.

TOWN / PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

[Amended plans]: No comment.

[Original plans]: Committee recommended approval but would request a condition be added stating that permitted rights for any alterations to the games/hobby room must be removed.

INTRODUCTION

Full planning permission is sought for proposed single- and two-storey side extensions to the existing dwelling and a new detached garage with hobby space above.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

In May 1979, planning permission was granted (by Tandridge District Council before boundary changes) for alterations, new lobby and two storey extension to form utility room and dining room with two bedrooms and bathroom over (TA/79/0323).

In October 1991, planning permission was granted (by Tandridge District Council before boundary changes) for the erection of an extension to provide guest room, family room on ground floor with studio and store (TA/91/P/0315).

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The site consists of a 2-storey detached dwelling, originally a bungalow and extended into the roofspace with a 2-storey extension and lean-to conservatory extension to the western side and a further flat-roofed single-storey extension to the eastern side. The property sits well back from the highway, accessed via a shared driveway with Oaklands to the west, which is in the same ownership. There is no boundary between these properties at the rear and car parking is shared via a turning head leading to a covered garage to the east. The overall garden area is substantial, backing onto ancient woodland to the rear, which is in Surrey. The built-up area boundary follows the extent of the non-ancient woodland within the site ownership, separated from the undulating garden, mainly laid to grass.

The site is located within the built-up area of East Grinstead and within 7km of the Ashdown Forest. It is designated as a Great Crested Newt - Impact Risk Zone (Red and Amber). The western end of the house and part of the garden to the west and north are in the Metropolitan Green Belt.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Full planning permission is sought for proposed single- and two-storey side extensions to the existing dwelling and a new detached garage with hobby space above.

The extensions to the house seek to unify the existing piecemeal design, with symmetrical gabled ends and cat-slide extensions flanking the central section. The entrance will be repositioned to the north. Materials will be a mix of painted brickwork and timber boarding beneath reconstituted slate roofs.

The proposal also includes the erection of a new garage/hobby room in front of the dwelling and adjacent to an existing garage outbuilding. New driveways will be extended to reach the garage and the dwelling entrance. The ground floor will consist of garaging/storage and car port with an external staircase leading to a hobby room above, with 2 dormer windows facing north, back towards the house. Materials will be timber boarding and a plain tiled roof.

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 Mid Sussex District Plan, Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) and the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan.

National policy (which is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance) does not form part of the development plan, but is an important material consideration.

Mid Sussex District Plan (Mar 2018)

The Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031 was adopted at Full Council on 28 March 2018.

Relevant policies:

Policy DP21: Transport

Policy DP26: Character and Design

Policy DP38: Biodiversity

Site Allocations DPD

The SADPD was adopted on 29 June 2022. It allocates sufficient housing and employment land to meet identified needs to 2031.

There are no relevant policies.

East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan (Nov 2016)

Mid Sussex District Council formally 'made' the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan part of the Local Development Plan for the Parish of East Grinstead as of 3 November 2016. The policies contained therein carry full weight as part of the Development Plan for planning decisions within East Grinstead.

Relevant policies:

Policy EG3: Promoting Good 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 the Stage 1 hearings were concluded on 31 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:

DPN2: Biodiversity Net Gain

DPB1: Character and Design

DPT4: Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure

Mid Sussex Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (Nov 2020)

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 4 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.

Relevant design principles include:

Principle DG49: General principles for extensions

Principle DG50: Front and side extensions

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Dec 2024)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 is also a material consideration and paragraphs 8 (overarching objectives), 11 (presumption in favour of sustainable development), 12 (status of development plan), 39 (decision-making), 48 (determining applications), 131 and 135 (design), 142, 143, 153-160 (Green Belt), 187 (conserving and enhancing the natural environment), 193 (biodiversity and ancient woodland), are considered to be relevant to this application.

ASSESSMENT

Green Belt

Whilst the application site is located within an area designated as Metropolitan Green Belt, there are no Development Plan policies that specifically refer to Green Belt. However, Chapter 13 of the NPPF (Dec 2024) is relevant. Paragraph 142 advises that ... *'The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent*

urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence.'

Paragraph 143 states:

'Green Belt serves five purposes:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;*
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;*
- c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;*
- d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and*
- e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.'*

Paragraphs 153-160 are also relevant, as follows:

153. 'When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt, including harm to its openness. Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

154. Development in the Green Belt is inappropriate unless one of the following exceptions applies:

- a) buildings for agriculture and forestry;*
- b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use), including buildings, for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments; as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;*
- c) the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building;*
- d) the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces;*
- e) limited infilling in villages;*
- f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites); and*
- g) limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed use including residential), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding temporary buildings), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt.*
- h) Other forms of development provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. These are:*
 - i. mineral extraction;*
 - ii. engineering operations;*
 - iii. local transport infrastructure which can demonstrate a requirement for a Green Belt location;*
 - iv. the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent and substantial construction;*
 - v. material changes in the use of land (such as changes of use for outdoor sport or recreation, or for cemeteries and burial grounds); and*
 - vi. development, including buildings, brought forward under a Community Right to Build Order or Neighbourhood Development Order.*

155. The development of homes, commercial and other development in the Green Belt should also not be regarded as inappropriate where:

- a. The development would utilise grey belt land and would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan;*
- b. There is a demonstrable unmet need for the type of development proposed;*
- c. The development would be in a sustainable location, with particular reference to paragraphs 110 and 115 of this Framework; and*

d. Where applicable the development proposed meets the 'Golden Rules' requirements set out in paragraphs 156-157 below.

156. Where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed on land released from the Green Belt through plan preparation or review, or on sites in the Green Belt subject to a planning application, the following contributions ('Golden Rules') should be made:

- a. affordable housing which reflects either: (i) development plan policies produced in accordance with paragraphs 67-68 of this Framework; or (ii) until such policies are in place, the policy set out in paragraph 157 below;*
- b. necessary improvements to local or national infrastructure; and*
- c. the provision of new, or improvements to existing, green spaces that are accessible to the public. New residents should be able to access good quality green spaces within a short walk of their home, whether through onsite provision or through access to offsite spaces.*

157. Before development plan policies for affordable housing are updated in line with paragraphs 67-68 of this Framework, the affordable housing contribution required to satisfy the Golden Rules is 15 percentage points above the highest existing affordable housing requirement which would otherwise apply to the development, subject to a cap of 50%. In the absence of a pre-existing requirement for affordable housing, a 50% affordable housing contribution should apply by default. The use of site-specific viability assessment for land within or released from the Green Belt should be subject to the approach set out in national planning practice guidance on viability.

158. A development which complies with the Golden Rules should be given significant weight in favour of the grant of permission.

159. The improvements to green spaces required as part of the Golden Rules should contribute positively to the landscape setting of the development, support nature recovery and meet local standards for green space provision where these exist in the development plan. Where no locally specific standards exist, development proposals should meet national standards relevant to the development (these include Natural England standards on accessible green space and urban greening factor and Green Flag criteria). Where land has been identified as having particular potential for habitat creation or nature recovery within Local Nature Recovery Strategies, proposals should contribute towards these outcomes.

160. When located in the Green Belt, elements of many renewable energy projects will comprise inappropriate development. In such cases developers will need to demonstrate very special circumstances if projects are to proceed. Such very special circumstances may include the wider environmental benefits associated with increased production of energy from renewable sources.'

In this instance, as the property lies within a residential area, within the built-up settlement boundary of East Grinstead, it is not considered that the proposal would represent inappropriate development that is harmful to the Green Belt. The proposal therefore complies with relevant policies of the NPPF.

Design and visual impact on the character and appearance of the area

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states (in part):

'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;*
- protects open spaces, trees and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;*
- positively addresses sustainability considerations in the layout and the building design;'*

Policy EG3 of the Neighbourhood Plan states:

'Planning permission will normally be granted where development proposals meet the following criteria:

- a) The form of the proposed development is proportionate and in keeping with the scale, height, materials and site coverage of the surrounding area;*
- b) The layout of the proposed development respects the topography and character of the site, protects important landscape features and does not harm adjoining amenity;*
- c) The proposal does not result in the loss of buildings or spaces that would have an unacceptable impact on the character of the area;*
- d) The proposal ensures satisfactory means of access for vehicles and pedestrians and provides adequate parking, cycle storage and refuse facilities on site;*
- e) The design of new buildings and the layout of spaces, including footways, car and cycle parking areas, should be permeable and provide connectivity with neighbouring areas;*
- f) New development must be inclusive and where appropriate make satisfactory provision for the safe and easy access for those with mobility impairment; and*
- g) The design of new developments must result in the creation of a safe and secure environment and incorporate adequate security measures and features to deter crime, fear of crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour; and*
- h) Proposals make provision for green infrastructure and biodiversity enhancement.*

Due to infrastructure constraints within the town, all new development proposals, which generate a net increase in traffic (excluding householder applications), will be required to contribute towards improving the walking and cycle network related to the development and be of a recognised acceptable standard.'

Chapter 9 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD relates to household extensions. Design Principle DG49 states that extensions should respond to the design of the original dwelling. Principle DG50 relates to front and side extensions and advises 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.

The existing dwelling is not visible from the public highway, being set so far back. Nonetheless, the scale and design of the proposed extensions to the house are deemed acceptable and will be an improvement on the appearance of the existing house, which has been developed and extended in a piecemeal fashion.

The design and scale of the garage building is also considered to be appropriate to its edge of built-up area context, and in context with the size of plot.

Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal would comply with Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policy EG3 of the Neighbourhood Plan and the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states (in part):

'All applicants will be required to demonstrate 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 Policy DP29)'*

Although the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan requires development not to harm adjoining amenity, the Mid Sussex District Plan seeks to ensure that development does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings. Paragraph: 084 Reference ID: 41-084-20180222 of the government's Planning Practice Guidance (Revision date: 22 02 2018) states: 'policies in a neighbourhood plan may become out of date, for example if they conflict with policies in a Local Plan that is adopted after the making of the neighbourhood plan. In such cases, the more recent plan policy takes precedence.' As the Mid Sussex District Plan is the most up-to-date Plan, then the correct test to apply in this instance is whether the impact of the development causes significant harm to neighbouring residents.

The main properties affected by the proposal would be Hill Glen to the south and the replacement house for Tresco (extant but unbuilt) and Woodlands to the east.

Braeside is set on lower ground than these neighbouring properties, within a dip and at a distance (over 40m to Hill Glen) and 23m corner-to-corner between the unbuilt house at Tresco and Braeside, and 32m corner to corner to Woodlands. Therefore it is not considered that the extensions to Braeside will have any significantly harmful impact to the amenities of neighbouring residents, in terms of being overbearing or causing overlooking.

The proposed garage building is sited closer to both neighbouring properties and following concerns originally expressed, the building was re-oriented and slightly repositioned. Although this is on higher ground (1.6m) than the two properties to the east (Tresco, unbuilt, and Woodlands, in situ) this would not be an overbearing relationship nor result in overlooking due to the dormers facing away from them. Hill Glen is a detached dwelling which is set unusually far back within its plot such that it has a long front garden but very shallow rear garden indeed. It is also set on slightly higher ground (0.6m). There would be a distance of approximately 10m between the buildings but as the garage is oriented away from this neighbouring dwelling, it would not result in any overlooking. It is not considered to be an overbearing building, given its height.

Accordingly, the scheme would comply with Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan.

Highways

Policy DP21 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states (in part):

'... Decisions on development proposals will take account of whether:

- *The scheme is sustainably located to minimise the need for travel noting there might be circumstances where development needs to be located in the countryside, such as rural economic uses (see policy DP14: Sustainable Rural Development and the Rural Economy);*
- *Appropriate opportunities to facilitate and promote the increased use of alternative means of transport to the private car, such as the provision of, and access to, safe and convenient routes for walking, cycling and public transport, including suitable facilities for secure and safe cycle parking, have been fully explored and taken up;*
- *The scheme is designed to adoptable standards, or other standards as agreed by the Local Planning Authority, including road widths and size of garages;*
- *The scheme provides adequate car parking for the proposed 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;*
- *Development which generates significant amounts of movement is supported by a Transport Assessment/ Statement and a Travel Plan that is effective and demonstrably deliverable including setting out how schemes will be funded;*
- *The scheme provides appropriate mitigation to support new development on the local and strategic road network, including the transport network outside of the district, secured where necessary through appropriate legal agreements;*
- *The scheme avoids severe additional traffic congestion, individually or cumulatively, taking account of any proposed mitigation;*
- *The scheme protects the safety of road users and pedestrians; and*
- *The scheme does not harm the special qualities of the South Downs National Park or the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty through its transport impacts.*

Where practical and viable, developments should be located and designed to incorporate facilities for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.

Neighbourhood Plans can set local standards for car parking provision provided that it is based upon evidence that provides clear and compelling justification for doing so.'

The proposal would result in additional parking spaces, albeit the site is sufficiently large and caters for existing car usage, so there would be no conflict with this policy.

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 site is located within a designated Great Crested Newt - Impact Risk Zone (Amber). However, having regard to the nature of the application, it is unlikely to have an impact on newts and accordingly there would be no conflict with the above legislation, policy and guidance.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

The application is deemed to be of an appropriate scale and design in relation to the existing house and surrounding area and would not cause significant detriment to surrounding residents. There would be no harm to biodiversity. Accordingly it is considered that the proposed development would comply with Policies DP21, DP26 and DP38 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policy EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan, the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD and the NPPF and is therefore considered acceptable.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Andrew Watt