

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/1462	Case Officer:	Andrew Horrell
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Demolition of an existing dwelling. Erection of a new extension to the retained dwelling comprising single storey living and bedroom accommodation. Front extension with bedroom wing.		
Site:	The Stables, Mill House, Old Hollow, Copthorne, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 4TB,		
Validation Date	1 Jul 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	10 Aug 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	18 Sep 2026
Target Date:	26 Aug 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Andrew Horrell

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	20 Sep 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/1462

The Stables, Mill House, Old Hollow, Copthorne, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 4TB
Demolition of an existing dwelling. Erection of a new extension to the retained dwelling
comprising single storey living and bedroom accommodation. Front extension with bedroom
wing.
Ben Ashmore

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Place Services Ecology: We understand from the Design & Access Statement (Victoria Mustard Architect, June 2026) that a semi-detached dwelling will be demolished and a front extension will be erected to an existing dwelling. It appears that the previous application DM/25/1967 for a similar proposal was granted permission on 24th October 2025. However, that proposal was not accompanied by a Preliminary Roost Assessment (PRA) for bats and the current proposal has also not been subject to a PRA. As demolition is taking place, there may be impact to roosting bats and therefore we recommend that a PRA is undertaken.'

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Worth Parish Council supports this application. However, the Parish Council requests that appropriate conditions be imposed to minimise disruption, including restrictions preventing the unloading of materials within Old Hollow and the specification of clear construction working hours.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of an existing dwelling and the erection of a new extension to the retained dwelling comprising single storey living and bedroom accommodation with a front extension with bedroom wing.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/24/3042 - Application made under Section 191 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to establish the lawfulness of 2no. independent residential dwellings (Use Class C3) and associated operational development. (Approved)

DM/25/1967 - Demolition of an existing dwelling. Erection of a new extension to the retained dwelling comprising single storey living and bedroom accommodation. Extension to existing rear deck area (approved)

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site consists of two single storey pitched roofed buildings with the building to the north labelled Dwelling 1 and the building to the south labelled as Dwelling 2. Dwelling 1 is characterised by timber clad walls, brown clay roof tiles and grey uPVC window and door frames. Dwelling 2 is characterised by timber clad walls, felt and corrugated metal roofing and timber window and door frames. Existing rear decking to dwelling 1.

The surrounding area is rural in its nature and it consists of woodland, open countryside and sporadic residential development. The private amenity spaces for the dwellings are located to the west of the dwellings and parking spaces are located to the east of the dwellings.

The site is accessed through a private track that is located to the east of the site and leads to another private road to the south of the site which leads to Old Hollow located to the west of the site, to the south of the site is the garden of Mill House and to the north is close boarded fencing to woodland to fields beyond.

The site is outside of the built-up area of Copthorne.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Dwelling 2 is to be demolished. This dwelling measures approximately 4.8m in depth, 11.65m in width with a height to eaves of 2.35m and an overall height of 4.2m. The attached sloped roofed woodstore is also to be removed which measures 2.35m in depth, 4.2m in width with a height to eaves of 1.65m and an overall height of 2.2m.

The proposed side extension is to match that previously approved under DM/25/1967 measures approximately 5.75m in depth, 13m in width with a height to eaves of 2.1m and an overall height of 4.1m to match the eaves and ridge height of the existing dwelling 1. This serves a living room, two bedrooms, an en-suite and a hallway.

The approved front extension is to match that previously approved under DM/25/1967 serving a front porch approximately measures 1.5m in depth, 2.7m in width with a height to eaves of 2.4m an overall height of 3.6m.

The proposed front extension measures approximately 5.3m in depth, 3.4m in width with a height to eaves of 2m and an overall height of 3.95m. This serves bedroom 4 and a family bathroom.

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 Copthorne 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:

DP12 - Protection and enhancement of countryside

DP21 - Transport

DP26 - Character and Design

DP38 - Biodiversity

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.

Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan

The Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan was formally made by the Council on 29th September 2021.

Relevant policies:

CNP1.1 - Design and Character
CNP1.2 - Neighbouring Amenities
CNP1.6 - Residential Extensions
CNP15 - Car Parking
CNP9 - CA2 - Agricultural Belt

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:

DPN1 - Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery
DPC1 - Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside
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) (August 2026)

WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments - September 2020

Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside

Policy DP12 of the District Plan relates to protection and enhancement of the countryside. In addition, policy CNP9 of the Neighbourhood Plan has a similar ethos. However, policy DP12 is considered to have very limited weight as it is materially inconsistent with the NPPF, and greater weight should be given to policies S3 and S5 of the NPPF.

Policy S5 of the NPPF in part states: *'Only certain forms of development should be approved outside settlements, as set out in the following list. These should be approved, unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework:*

c. The reuse, extension, alteration or replacement of an existing building, provided that the existing building is of permanent and substantial construction, is lawful in planning terms, and any extension or alteration will not result in a disproportionate increase in size compared to the existing building. In the case of proposals for a replacement building, it should be for the same use and not disproportionately larger than the one it replaces'

Given the domestic nature of the proposal and the limited increase in size from the existing building(s) and the previously approved enlargement, it is therefore considered to protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

Due to the above, the proposal complies with DP12 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, CN9 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan and S5 of the NPPF.

Design and Character

Policy DP26 of the District Plan relates to character and design. In addition, policy CNP1.1, 1.6 and CNP12 of the Neighbourhood Plan has a similar ethos. However, policy DP26 and the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan are considered to have 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 in part states:

'To create well-designed places, development proposals should also reflect relevant aspects of the following principles, as appropriate to the nature of the development and its location.

e. Built Form: use the pattern of buildings to define the arrangement of streets, squares and other spaces, promote compact forms of development to optimise the site's potential, distinguish between public and private areas, create focal points and, where appropriate, enhance views into and out of the scheme;

g. Identity: create visually attractive, distinctive and characterful development to establish or maintain a strong sense of place and pride, including through the use of a coherent palette of materials, design features and planting'.

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 front and side extensions and states:

'Front extensions are more likely to be acceptable where the building line is staggered or where the dwelling is set well back from the road. They are less likely to be acceptable in streets with a strong consistent building form as they risk disrupting the underlying order.

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

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 loss of dwelling 2 is regretted, although it is noted it was previously an outbuilding formalised into a dwelling by a lawful development certificate.

The proposed side and rear extensions are a modest enlargement in relation to the demolished dwelling 2. It will use matching materials and would be visually similar to the existing dwelling 1.

The proposed porch is a modest enlargement to the existing dwelling and complies with DG50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide.

The larger front extension serving bedroom 4 and the family bathroom is a fair enlargement but would be no higher than the existing dwelling and would use matching materials and would be viewed in the context of the existing outbuilding to which it mirrors.

The proposal therefore complies with policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policies CNP1 and CNP12 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan and principles DG49 and DG50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide and DP3 of the NPPF.

Highways Matters and Parking Standards

Policy DP21 of the District Plan seeks to ensure that schemes are sustainably located to minimise the need for travel, and protect the safety of road users and pedestrians, and seeks to provide adequate parking in relation to development proposals. Policy DP21 is considered to have very limited weight as is neighbourhood plan policy CNP15 as it is materially inconsistent with the NPPF, and greater weight should be given to policies TR3, TR4 and TR6 of the NPPF.

Policy TR3 of the NPPF in part states:

'Opportunities should be taken to utilise existing or proposed transport infrastructure'

Policy TR4 of the NPPF in part states:

'Provide a suitable number of parking spaces for a range of transport modes where appropriate, reflecting the location and nature of the development (including its connectivity), any locally-set standards in the development plan, and including adequate provision of spaces and infrastructure that allow for the charging of electric vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations'.

Policy TR6 of the NPPF states:

'Development proposals should be refused if they would have a severe adverse impact on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion, including cumulative impacts), or an unacceptable impact on highway safety; taking into account any mitigation measures proposed as well as any wider network improvements, including measures to support sustainable patterns of movement'.

The proposal does not seek to alter the existing vehicular entrance to the site and due to the nature of the application it is considered that a similar level of vehicular movements will occur at the site. As such it is not considered to adversely impact the wider road network.

As an increase from 2 to 4 bedrooms is proposed, parking standards need to be assessed.

There are more than 4 off road car parking spaces which will remain to the front of the dwellinghouse.

The WSCC Car Parking Demand Calculator recommends that a dwelling with 3 bedrooms in this location has 3 off road parking spaces. As such, it is considered that sufficient off-road parking will remain, thereby acceding with policy DP21 of the District Plan and policy CNP15 of the Neighbourhood Plan and policies TR3, TR4 and TR6 of the NPPF.

Neighbouring Amenities

In assessing the potential impact of the proposed development works upon the neighbouring amenities consideration needs to be given to District Plan Policy DP26. Policy CNP1.2 of the Neighbourhood Plan has a similar ethos.

However, policy DP26 and the neighbourhood Plan policy are considered to have very limited weight as it is materially inconsistent with the NPPF, and greater weight should be given to policies L2 and P3 of the NPPF.

Policy L2 of the NPPF in part states:

'Maintain safe access and egress for occupiers and users, and acceptable living standards for residents and neighbours in terms of access to daylight, sunlight, privacy and external amenity space'

Policy P3 of the NPPF states in part that:

'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. Adverse impacts of this nature should be avoided where possible, or else mitigated to an acceptable degree. Where possible, opportunities should be taken to reduce pollution affecting the wider area (such as through traffic and travel management or improved external lighting)'

Given the single storey nature of the proposal and it comprises of a similar footprint to dwelling 2 and the detached relationship with the neighbouring properties, significant harm is therefore not deemed to be caused by the proposal in relation to neighbouring amenities.

Therefore, unacceptable harm will not be caused. Therefore, in terms of neighbouring amenities, the proposal complies with DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and CNP1.2 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan.

Biodiversity

DP38 of the Mid Sussex District Plan relates to biodiversity.

However, policy DP38 and the neighbourhood Plan policy are considered to have very limited weight as it is materially inconsistent with the NPPF, and greater weight should be given to policy N2 of the NPPF.

N2 of the NPPF in part states:

'Minimise any adverse impacts on biodiversity and include features which support priority or threatened species such as swifts, bats and hedgehogs'.

The Council's ecology consultants requested a bat survey is undertaken before the demolition of dwelling 2. The agent has confirmed that this part of the dwelling has already been demolished in view of the previous approval on the site. Given that demolition works have already taken place, a bat survey is not required.

Biodiversity Net Gain

Biodiversity net gain is required under a statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Under the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain this application comprises of development which was submitted as a householder planning application and is therefore exempt from providing biodiversity net gain.

Other Matters

The comments of the Parish Council are noted, however, it is not considered that the requested condition would be meet the required test in this instance, given the modest nature of the proposed works.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

The proposal is deemed in character with the existing dwelling and the wider streetscene, it would not harm the rural character, complies with parking standards and highway safety and the harm on neighbouring amenities is not deemed unacceptable.

The proposal is considered to accord with Policies DP12, DP21 and DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, CNP1.1, CN1.2, CNP1.6, CNP9 and CNP12 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan, Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD, the relevant policies of the NPPF. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Andrew Horrell