

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/3162	Case Officer:	Caroline Grist
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed single storey side and rear extension. Infill of first floor balcony, replacement of existing garage and replacement windows to property.		
Site:	Southfields, Keymer Road, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 0AN, , ,		
Validation Date	19 Jan 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	28 May 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	3 Jun 2026
Target Date:	16 Mar 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Caroline Grist</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Steven King</i>	Date:	4 Jun 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/3162

**Southfields, Keymer Road, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 0AN, ,
Proposed single storey side and rear extension. Infill of first floor balcony, replacement of
existing garage and replacement windows to property.
Sharghy**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

No representations have been received in response to this application.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Southern Water

No objection.

TOWN COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

First Response

The Committee of the 27th January would recommend approval.

Second Response

The Committee of the 1st June had a similar view to when this application was previously considered on 27th January and would recommend approval - subject to adherence to the arboricultural report.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought for a single storey side and rear extension, infill of first floor balcony, replacement of existing garage and replacement windows to the property.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

09/03127/FUL - Erection of a detached two storey four bedroom house and garage on the land at the rear of Charmouth Oaks. Access to the new house to be created with a private access road at the side of Charmouth Oaks. Permission.

DM/22/2525 - Proposed two storey extension to the southeast corner of the dwelling, a first floor extension to the southwest corner, a replacement of the existing garage with a two storey extension and single storey infill between the main house, as well as an increase in the existing roof ridge height. Introduction of new timber cladding. Existing glazing to be replaced with grey aluminium framed windows together with new floor to ceiling windows to the eastern, southern and western elevations. New terrace to first floor. New secondary entrance. Withdrawn.

DM/23/2779 - Proposed two storey extension to the southeast corner of the dwelling, a first floor extension to the southwest corner, a single storey side extension to the north, a replacement of the existing garage, as well as an increase in the existing roof ridge height. Existing glazing to be replaced with grey aluminium framed windows. Permission.

DM/25/2795 - Non Material Amendment to planning application DM/23/2779 - Various amendments to application to reduce the scope of the project. Refused.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Southfields is a west facing, detached, two storey dwelling. It is constructed of red brick, with tile hanging at the first floor level, a plain tile roof and upvc windows. The dwelling has a staggered frontage with the recessed section having a canopy over the front door that continues over the remaining front section. The rear elevation is also staggered with the projecting section including an enclosed balcony that is glazed on two sides. To the front of the dwelling is a detached, red brick, pitched roof, south facing garage.

The application site is situated within the built up area of Burgess Hill and was built to the rear of Charmouth Oaks. As such there are neighbouring dwellings on all sides of the application site. Access is gained from Keymer Road, which is to the west of the site.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Planning permission is firstly sought for single storey extensions to the house. A single storey side extension is proposed to the northern elevation in order to create a W.C. and utility room. It is to be some 2.3 metres wide and 7.8 metres deep. A lean to roof is proposed that would measure approximately 2.5 metres to the eaves and 3.5 metres to the ridge. An extension is also proposed to the rear that would contain the dining room. This would be some 3.0 metres deep and 5.4 metres wide, creating a flush rear elevation. This addition is to have a flat roof with an overall height of approximately 3.0 metres. In terms of materials the side extension is to be finished in brick and the rear extension timber cladding.

At the first floor level it is proposed to enclose the existing balcony. This area is some 1.9 metres wide and 2.7 metres deep. No changes are proposed to the existing roof form to accommodate the works.

It is also proposed to replace the existing double garage. The new garage is to be in a similar position but would have a larger footprint. The depth is to remain at some 6.0 metres whilst the width would be 8.4 metres, some 2.4 metres bigger. It is to have a pitched roof design that would measure approximately 3.1 metres to the eaves and 5.1 metres to the ridge.

Lastly it is proposed to replace the existing upvc windows in the house with metal framed windows.

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 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

DP37 - Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows

Site Allocation Development Plan Document

The Site Allocation DPD 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

The Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan was made in January 2016.

No relevant planning policies.

Other Material Considerations

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
DPS6 - Health and Wellbeing
DPN4 - Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
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)

ASSESSMENT

Design and impact upon the character of the area

Policy DP26 of the District Plan relates to character and design and requires all proposals to be well designed and reflect the distinctive character of the towns and villages as well as addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape.

The Council's adopted Design Guide is a material consideration in the determination of the application. Chapter 9 of the Design Guide relates to household extensions. Design Principle DG49 states that extensions should respond to the design of the original dwelling, and that the extension shall be well integrated allowing the original building to remain the dominant element of the property. In relation to side extensions, principle DG50 states they should normally be subservient to the original dwelling and typically set back from the front of the house. They also need to respond appropriately to the character of the street form. Principle DG51 relates to rear extensions and states that these can be of a contemporary architectural approach. However, rear extensions should have consideration for the character of the existing building and the relationship of the extension with the side boundaries and adjacent buildings and gardens.

The eastern side of the highway also contains back land development and there is a group of houses, to the rear, of which the application property is one of them.

Planning permission is sought for a range of extensions and alterations to Southfields.

With regards to the side extension it is acknowledged that no set back is shown, however the proposed width is such that it would not visually compete with the main house. This width, combined with the single storey nature of the addition, would create a subordinate addition as required by the Design Guide.

The proposed ground floor extension to the rear would be flush with the host dwelling, whilst at the first floor, works would only relate to infilling an existing balcony area. The scale of these works is not considered to be excessive, nor would they create a dominant feature. The ground floor extension is to be of a flat roof design with elevations finished in a combination of vertical and horizontal timber cladding. The Design Guide sets out that a more contemporary approach can be considered acceptable for rear extensions, which this extension would accord with. The balcony infill is to retain the existing roof form and be finished in render to match the main house.

The replacement windows to the dwelling, whilst contemporary, would work with the existing openings and would retain their overall proportions. As such they are not considered to be harmful to the overall character of the building.

The proposal also seeks permission to replace the existing garage with a larger building. In terms of the proposed scale, the new building is to be some 2.4 metres longer and 1.0 metre deeper than the current garage. This would allow the building to more comfortably accommodate 2 cars, compared to the existing structure. Whilst larger, it is not considered that the scale of the building, in relation to the main house and the wider plot, would result in an overdevelopment of the site. Furthermore the footprint of the garage would not appear disproportionate to the size of the dwelling. It is acknowledged that the roof height would increase, particularly in relation to the main house, but this would allow for a fully pitched roof to be created. It is further noted that the adjacent garage at 3 Keymer Place has a taller pitched roof. Given this context it is therefore considered that this roof form would be acceptable.

Given the position of the dwelling, public views to the proposed works would be limited and glimpsed between buildings. Overall it is considered that, together, the proposal would not result in the existing building being dominated by extensions. The character of the dwelling would be altered but it would retain the overall design approach and would create a cohesive appearance. It is therefore concluded that the works to the house would not have a harmful appearance to the character of the surrounding area.

An arboricultural report has been submitted as part of this application. It shows that there is a palm tree to the front of the house as well as a willow and an ash in the rear boundary. None of these trees are protected by a Tree Preservation Order or by virtue of being located in a Conservation Area. There are also a number of hedges identified. A tree report has been provided that sets out only the palm tree is to be removed and a replacement apple tree is to be provided in the rear garden. Protective fencing is also proposed to protect the other trees, and some hedging, during construction works. This is considered to be acceptable and a condition can be attached to any consent to ensure that this is adhered to during the course of the development.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan seeks to ensure that new 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 DP27).'*

The proposed single storey side extension is to be positioned on the northern elevation, closest to 3 Keymer Place. This neighbour is set away from the shared boundary and has no ground floor side windows facing the application site. There is also an existing boundary fence between these two houses and the proposed roof design would slope away from No. 3. Given these factors it is considered that the proposal would not result in a loss of light or outlook to this neighbour. Due to the single storey nature of the proposed addition and surrounding boundary treatments, it is considered that this addition would not give rise to overlooking.

With regards to the rear extension, this would be closest to Brookwood. Given the arrangement of these two properties and the single storey nature of this extension, it is considered that there would not be a significant loss of light or outlook arising. No windows are proposed that would result in any direct overlooking.

In terms of enclosing the existing balcony, this would not enlarge the existing building and so would not give rise to overlooking or loss of light concerns. Whilst a window is proposed on the rear elevation, given it would replace a balcony, it is not considered to give rise to any overlooking concerns beyond the current arrangement.

A new first floor window is proposed in the southern elevation, which is shown as relating to the master en-suite. The submitted plans, however, show that the window is to be obscure glazed, which would prevent any potential overlooking. A condition can be attached to any consent to ensure that this does occur.

With regards to the replacement garage it would be positioned closest to Charmouth Oaks, to the west of the site. The garage would be approximately 0.5 metres away from the shared boundary and it is noted that the eaves and ridge heights are to be increased. However the proposed position of the garage is such that it would not be directly behind this neighbour, rather to one side. It is to be set away from the rear elevation of Charmouth Oaks and the true pitch that would be created will slope away from this neighbour, reducing the visual impact that would occur. It is therefore concluded that the garage would not affect the light or outlook available into Charmouth Oaks, nor would it significantly impact light into the garden. Whilst there would be some impact to outlook within the garden, it would be limited and, given the design and existing situation, would not be significant enough to warrant the refusal of this application. No windows are proposed in the garage. It is noted that the garage is more substantial and works would restrict the level of external space available and, as such, it is therefore considered to be reasonable to include a condition restricting its use.

Due to the domestic nature of the proposed development there would not be a harmful impact in terms of noise, air or light pollution.

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 would accord with the requirements of policies DP26 and DP37 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and the Mid Sussex Design Guide. It is therefore considered acceptable.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Caroline Grist