

## Delegated Decision

### Sign off Sheet

|                                       |                                                                                                |                                 |                      |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| Ref. No:                              | DM/24/2959                                                                                     | Case Officer:                   | Stefan Galyas        |
| Application Type:                     | Full Application                                                                               |                                 |                      |
| Proposal:                             | Proposed change of use from commercial warehouse to proposed gym use on ground and first floor |                                 |                      |
| Site:                                 | Mabels Emporium, 10 Victoria Way, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 9NF, , ,                     |                                 |                      |
| Validation Date                       | 11 Dec 2024                                                                                    | Overall Expiry Date:            | 26 Mar 2025          |
| Pre-Commencement Conditions Required: |                                                                                                | Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed: |                      |
| Recommendation:                       | Permission                                                                                     | Recommendation Date:            | 3 Apr 2025           |
| Target Date:                          | 5 Feb 2025                                                                                     | Recommending Officer Signature: | <i>Stefan Galyas</i> |

|                                                 |  |                        |   |
|-------------------------------------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable) |  | No of Representations: | 6 |
|-------------------------------------------------|--|------------------------|---|

|                       |                        |       |            |
|-----------------------|------------------------|-------|------------|
| Signed and Agreed By: | <i>Stephen Ashdown</i> | Date: | 4 Apr 2025 |
| Comments:             |                        |       |            |

## MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

**DM/24/2959**

**Mabels Emporium, 10 Victoria Way, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 9NF, ,  
Proposed change of use from commercial warehouse to proposed gym use on ground and first floor**

**AJ Singh Real Estate**

### **SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS**

There was a total of nine letters of representation received in response to the development proposal. These representation letters were received at different stages of the application and a number of revisions have been made to the proposal throughout the applications timeline. Nine letters objected to the proposed development and the following reasons were cited:

- o Causing an issue with car parking which is a pre-existing issue with the café on site. The locality's parking situation is further exacerbated by the other gym in a nearby vicinity. It was also noted that the proposal had the potential to increase the amount of traffic received by the road throughout the industrial estate.
- o There already being three gyms within a close proximity to the site.
- o The site being positioned in an area with a high risk of surface water flooding whereby minor extensions should not be permitted as per the Environment Agencies standing advice. The extension therefore would have the potential to have a significant harmful impact towards the surrounding land, including residential dwellings and commercial properties.
- o A loss of privacy for the neighbouring occupiers as the extension would run to the edges of the site, allowing views into local properties at all hours of the day due to the 24-hour usage. It was noted that nearby properties are occupied by children and vulnerable residents.
- o Reduction of sunlight received into the neighbouring property due to the height of the extension and proximity to the boundary. It was noted that some of the nearby gardens are south-facing and therefore the overshadowing impact would be significant.
- o The proposed design not being sympathetic to the existing buildings within the area, failing to use sympathetic materials.
- o The gym being used 24 hours a day whilst being unstaffed, resulting in a significant increase in noise and light pollution. This would not be in keeping with other businesses within the area which operate at more common opening hours.
- o The potential for there to be hazardous materials on site such as asbestos which could in turn pose a threat to nearby residents and pollute neighbouring land.
- o The potential to adversely affect nearby trees and their roots which could harm the localities biodiversity.
- o No demonstration of the building being fire safe and escapable in the event of a fire.
- o There being no discernible benefits to the scheme which would outweigh the significant flood risk and other harm caused by the rear extension.
- o The proposed extension to be overbearing in size and scale.
- o The site is affected by a long-standing historic flood risk issue which would be exacerbated by the proposed extension.
- o Additional constraints on the Environment Agency being incurred as a result of the potential noise complaints.
- o The sites positioning nearby the entrance and exit on one of the busiest roads through the industrial estate which is already accommodating parked cars to either side. This could therefore result in traffic and congestion problems on a local level.
- o The alterations to the schemes design not changing the standing issue of inadequate parking facilities.
- o The outdoor area should remain closed at a reasonable hour and plans should indicate what the outdoor space would be used for. The plans do not demonstrate sufficient information or supporting evidence.

## **SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES**

### **Flood Risk and Drainage:**

No objection.

### **Environmental Protection:**

*Environmental Health has reviewed the application for a two-storey rear extension and proposed gym use at 10 Victoria Way, Burgess Hill. The proposed gym is noted to be approximately 4 to 5 metres from the gardens of neighbouring residential properties and around 20 to 25 metres from their facades. Given the proposed 24-hour operation, there is potential for noise impacts, particularly during night-time hours when background noise levels are generally lower, increasing the likelihood of disturbance.*

*The application does not provide clarity on the location or specification of air conditioning units or other plant and machinery that may be required for the gym. Such equipment has the potential to generate noise, which could cause disturbance to nearby residents if not properly assessed and controlled.*

*To address these concerns, a detailed noise assessment will be required. This should be carried out in line with the ProPG Gym Acoustic Guidance (GAG) Document (March 2023) to assess noise arising from gym activities, including amplified music, equipment impact noise, and general operational noise during sensitive hours. Additionally, an assessment in accordance with BS4142 will be necessary to evaluate the impact of any external plant or machinery, focusing on its potential to affect nearby residential properties.*

*Depending on the outcomes of these assessments, appropriate mitigation measures may need to be proposed and implemented to ensure that noise is effectively managed and complies with the relevant standards. These measures should be clearly detailed by the applicant and submitted for review prior to the commencement of construction. It is essential that this requirement is made very clear to the applicant, as there have been instances where gyms have been constructed without adequate mitigation in place, leading to noise problems being identified later. Retrospective works to address these issues can be costly and disruptive, potentially requiring the removal of flooring and equipment that has already been installed.*

### **West Sussex County Council Highways Authority:**

*This application seeks the change of use from Use Class E(a) to Use Class E(d) for use as a gym. The site is located on Victoria Way, an unclassified road subject to a speed restriction of 30 mph.*

*For context, WSCC in its role as Local Highway Authority (LHA) previously provided consultation advice for this site for application DM/16/3971, raising no highway safety concerns.*

*Regarding the current submission, no alterations are proposed to the existing vehicular access arrangement. The LHA does not anticipate that the proposed change of use would give rise to a significant material intensification of movements when compared with the existing permitted use.*

*Existing parking provision within the site frontage is to be retained, with local mapping suggesting there are approximately 12 off-street car parking spaces available for use. I note that under WSCC Parking Standards for Class E(d) use, 28 car parking spaces would be expected for a development of this size.*

*Whilst this shortfall is acknowledged, the proposed parking demand is less than what would be expected for the existing Class E(a) use, which operated for a number of years without any reported issues. Consideration must also be given to the site's sustainable location, being well accessible on foot, by cycle and by public transport. The LHA would request that cycle parking provision be provided to promote sustainable transport methods.*

*If overspill parking were to occur on-street, there are parking restrictions in place nearby that prohibit vehicles from parking in places that would be detrimental to highway safety. The LHA does not anticipate*

*a highway safety concern or parking capacity issue, but the LPA may wish to consider the potential impacts on on-street parking from an amenity point of view.*

*In summary, the LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 116), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.*

#### **Southern Water:**

No objection.

#### **Mid Sussex District Council Corporate Estates:**

No response received.

#### **TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS**

Town Council: *Recommend Refusal. The Committee stated there was a lack of documentation and evidence, which was required to make a decision, but raised the following concerns;*

*District plan;  
DP21 Transport  
DP29 Noise, Air and Light Pollution  
DP39 Sustainable Design and Construction  
DP41 Flood Risk and Drainage*

*They also raised concern about the of fire exits and fire safety and requested an acoustic assessment was completed.*

There was no response received following a re-consultation.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The application seeks planning permission for a change of use from a commercial warehouse into a 24-hour gym use.

#### **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

BH/182/81 - Retention of use, with the clause "and the permission shall operate for the benefit of D.F Warehouses Ltd only" to be wholly lifted. Permission 18.08.1981.

BH/238/81 - Change of use to light industrial. Permission 15.12.1981.

BH/107/88 - Change of use of ground floor for warehousing of office furniture and equipment and use of building without compliance with condition 2 attached to BH/238/81. Permission 10.06.1988.

01/02399/FUL - Permission to use ground floor and first floor of premises for display of kitchen and bathroom goods, without complying with condition 2 of planning consent BH/107/88. Permission 14.01.2001.

04/00640/FUL - Re-design front elevation. Withdrawn 02.03.2004.

DM/16/3971 - Retrospective change of use of premises from B1 (light industrial) to mixed use A1/A3 (retail/café). Permission 24.11.2016.

#### **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

The application relates to 10 Victoria Way, a detached two storey industrial sized building with a pitched roof. The existing building is positioned to the northern side of the road and is set back from the highway edge by a front parking area. There is an astroturfed area to the rear of the building which is enclosed by timber fencing to the sites boundaries. The existing building is composed of metal corrugated sheets and exposed brickwork to the exterior walls, a corrugated sheet pitched roof and uPVC windows and doors.

With regards to the sites locality, the building is positioned amongst other industrial sized buildings and therefore contributes to the prevailing industrial estate character of the area. There are some residential dwellings set further to the north of the site, with garden amenity space immediately abutting the sites northern boundary.

With regard to policy constraints, the site is located within the built-up area for Burgess Hill.

## **APPLICATION DETAILS**

The development proposal would change the use of the existing premises from an existing commercial warehouse into a proposed gym both at ground and first floor level. The scheme was revised in several iterations to remove any extension in footprint to the existing built form. Additionally, a cycle storage space would be provided to the front (south) of the building.

## **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.

Specifically, Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states:

*'In dealing with such an application the authority shall have regard to:*

- a) The provisions of the development plan, so far as material to application,*
- b) And local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and*
- c) Any other material considerations.'*

Section 38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides:

*'If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purposes of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.'*

The requirement to determine applications "in accordance with the plan" does not mean applications must comply with each and every policy but is to be approached on the basis of the plan taken as a whole. This reflects the fact, acknowledged by the Courts, that development plans can have broad statements of policy, many of which may be mutually irreconcilable so that in a particular case one must give way to another.

Under section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 if a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan, the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approved or published.

Using this as the starting point the development plan for this part of Mid Sussex consists of the District Plan, Site Allocations 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:

DP1: Sustainable Economic Development

DP21: Transport

DP26: Character and Design

DP29: Noise, Air and Light Pollution

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.

Relevant policies.

### **Neighbourhood Plan**

Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan (Made January 2016)

None relevant.

### **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 the 31st 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:

DPS1 - Climate Change

DPH12 - Accessibility

DPS2 - Sustainable Design and Construction

DPB1 - Character and Design

DPT4 - Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure

DPN6 - Pollution

DPN7 - Noise Impacts

DPN8 - Light Impacts and Dark Skies

DPS4: Flood Risk and Drainage

#### *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)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 is a material consideration.

Paragraphs 2, 8, 11, 39, 48, 141, 131, 135 & 139.

The NPPF sets out the government's policy in order to ensure that the planning system contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. Paragraph 8 sets out the three objectives to sustainable

development, such that the planning system needs to perform an economic objective, a social objective and an environmental objective.

Paragraph 12 of the NPPF states '*The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision-making. Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan (including any neighbourhood plans that form part of the development plan), permission should not usually be granted. Local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.*'

Paragraph 39 of the NPPF states '*Local planning authorities should approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way. They should use the full range of planning tools available, including brownfield registers and permission in principle, and work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.*'

With specific reference to decision-taking paragraph 48 states that planning decisions must be taken in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

### National Planning Policy Guidance

#### *National Design Guide*

Published in 2021, the National Design Guide illustrates how the government consider well-designed places that are beautiful, healthy, greener, enduring and successful can be achieved in practice.

Paragraph 134 of the NPPF sets out that this national document, along with the National Model Design Code, should be used to guide decisions on application in the absence of locally design guides or design codes.

## **ASSESSMENT**

It is considered that the main issues that need to be considered in the determination of this application are as follows;

- Principle
- Impact on Character and Design
- Impact on Neighbouring Amenities
- Highways Impact
- Flood Risk and Drainage
- Other Matters
- Biodiversity Net Gain

### **Principle**

The principle of converting an existing building within Use Class E into another subclass within Class E is considered to be acceptable and in accordance with what would be considered permitted development. Additionally, the conversion of an existing building to be used in connection with employment is generally considered to be acceptable and in accordance with the provisions of DP1 of the Mid Sussex District Plan.

### **Impact on Character and Design, Including Heritage Assets**

DP26 of the 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:*

- o is of high quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace;*
- o 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;*
- o creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape;*
- o protects open spaces, trees and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;*
- o 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"*

The National Design Guide (2021) states in Paragraph 44 that:

*"to communicate the benefits of a scheme, it is important to explain how the design of a development relates to context and local character."* It adds that

*"well-designed places and buildings are influenced positively by:*

- o The history and heritage of the site, its surroundings and the wider area, including cultural influences;*
- o The significance and setting of heritage assets and any other specific features that merit conserving and enhancing;*
- o The local vernacular, including historical building typologies such as the terrace, town house, mews, villa or mansion block, the treatment of facades, characteristic materials and details"* (Paragraph 46).

The proposal was revised in several forms and eventually removed any proposed extension to the existing building. As such, the proposed application would solely alter the interior and it is not considered that there would be a substantial alteration to the buildings exterior as indicated by the plans.

A covered cycle storage area would be installed within the front (south) car parking area. Given the areas existing and intended use as an off road parking area, it is not considered that the proposed cycle store would appear overly incongruous within this context.

In view of the above, the proposal is considered to comply with Policies DP26 of the District Plan.

### **Impact on Neighbouring Amenities**

In terms of impact upon neighbouring amenities, Policy DP26 in part seeks to ensure 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 DP29);'*

DP29 then elaborates further with regard to noise, air and light pollution:

*The environment, including nationally designated environmental sites, nationally protected landscapes, areas of nature conservation or geological interest, wildlife habitats, and the quality of people's life will be protected from unacceptable levels of noise, light and air pollution by only permitting development where:*

*Noise pollution:*

- o It is designed, located and controlled to minimise the impact of noise on health and quality of life, neighbouring properties and the surrounding area;*
  - o If it is likely to generate significant levels of noise it incorporates appropriate noise attenuation measures;*
- Noise sensitive development, such as residential, will not be permitted in close proximity to existing or proposed development generating high levels of noise unless adequate sound insulation measures, as supported by a noise assessment are incorporated within the development.*

*In appropriate circumstances, the applicant will be required to provide:*

- o an assessment of the impact of noise generated by a proposed development; or*
- o an assessment of the effect of noise by an existing noise source upon a proposed development;*

*Light pollution:*

- o The impact on local amenity, intrinsically dark landscapes and nature conservation areas of artificial lighting proposals (including floodlighting) is minimised, in terms of intensity and number of fittings;*
- o The applicant can demonstrate good design including fittings to restrict emissions from proposed lighting schemes;*

*Air Pollution:*

- o It does not cause unacceptable levels of air pollution;*
  - o Development on land adjacent to an existing use which generates air pollution or odour would not cause any adverse effects on the proposed development or can be mitigated to reduce exposure to poor air quality to recognised and acceptable levels;*
  - o Development proposals (where appropriate) are consistent with Air Quality Management Plans.*
- The degree of the impact of noise and light pollution from new development or change of use is likely to be greater in rural locations, especially where it is in or close to specially designated areas and sites'.*

The proposal would not increase the existing built footprint and therefore is not considered to result in a worsening of the existing arrangement with regard to overshadowing or overbearing towards the nearby neighbouring occupiers. It is noted that a number of high-level windows would be installed to the buildings side (eastern) elevation. It is considered that these windows would be used to supply light into the gym at first floor level and would not offer a substantial degree of outlook given their siting close to the eaves. In any circumstance, the neighbouring site to the immediately to the east is not within residential use.

Concerns were raised through letters of objection towards the potential noise impact from the gym being in a 24-hour use and what effect this would have towards the nearby residential occupiers. A detailed noise assessment would be required in order to satisfy concerns raised by the Environmental Protection Officer in the instance that planning permission is granted. This would be required to detail the noise impact arising from the various gym activities, particularly during the sensitive hours. Such details can be secured through an appropriately worded condition in the interest of protecting the amenities of the nearby neighbouring residential properties.

A letter of objection noted that the proposal would give rise to an unacceptable impact with regard to light pollution by virtue of the buildings 24 hours use. It is considered that the proposal is set within a urbanised environment and not within a intrinsically dark landscaped area. Furthermore, no further concerns were raised with regard to light spill following consultation with the Environmental protection Officer. As such, it is not considered that the proposal would give rise to a significantly unacceptable impact with regard to light pollution.

It was raised following consultation with the neighbouring occupiers that the plans lacked conciseness with regards to the use of outside area to the rear (north) of the building. Further correspondence with the Applicant clarified that this area would be used for storage and not for outdoor classes. No further comments were raised with regard to this area following a re-consultation with Environmental Protection. Provided that this area would be used for storage, a restrictive condition on the use of this area is not considered to reasonably pass the six tests for planning conditions.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered to comply with the provisions of DP26 and DP29 of the Mid Sussex District Plan in terms of neighbouring amenities.

## **Highways Impact**

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or residual cumulative impacts on

the road network would be severe. Additionally, Policy DP21 of the District Plan requires development proposals to protect the safety of road users and pedestrians.

Policy DP21 of the District Plan requires schemes to provide adequate car parking whilst taking into account the accessibility, type, mix and use of the development.

The local highway authority was consulted and provided no objection towards the proposed scheme. It was commented that the proposed change of use would give rise to a significant material intensification of movements when compared to the existing use. There are approximately 12 off-street car parking spaces provided currently on site and 28 car parking spaces would be expected for a development of this size. However, the current use on site has been undersupplied and a greater level of consideration should be given towards the sites accessibility on foot, by cycle and public transport. A condition ensuring that works are carried out in accordance with the proposed cycle store is considered necessary and relevant in the instance that planning permission is granted.

As such, it is not considered that the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact with regard to highway safety or result in severe cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network.

### **Flood Risk and Drainage**

DP41 of the District Plan notes 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.*

Whilst there is an identified risk of surface water flooding to the rear of the site within the 1:30 extent, the proposed development would not extend the buildings footprint further into this area. As such, the proposed development would not increase the impermeable surface area and further exacerbate the risk of flooding on site. No objection was provided in response to the current proposal from the Drainage Engineers.

### **Other Matters**

The proposed elevations do not appear to show any signage to display the new use and service being offered at the premises. As such, in order for any proposed signage to be considered permitted development in the future, compliance with Schedule 3 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007. If compliance with these provisions cannot be demonstrated, advertisement consent will likely be required.

With regards to existing asbestos on site and proposed fire exit, it is not considered that these are material planning considerations and can be covered off at the Building Regulations stage. Should further issues arise at this stage of the development, the relevant necessary procedures should be followed such as work involving asbestos only being allowed to be carried out by a licenced asbestos contractor.

It is acknowledged that there are a number of established trees within a proximity of the site and an extension had the potential to encroach on the existing root protection areas. Nevertheless, the revised proposal is not considered to result in a harmful impact towards these nearby trees as the building would not be further increased in footprint.

### **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 is comprises development below the de-minimis threshold meaning that this development is exempt from providing biodiversity net gain.

### **PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION**

Planning legislation requires the application to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It is therefore necessary for the planning application to be assessed against the policies in the Development Plan and then to take account of other material planning considerations including the NPPF. The Development Plan in this instance consists of the Mid Sussex District Plan, the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan.

Courts have confirmed that the Development Plan must be considered as a whole, not simply in relation to any one individual policy. It is therefore not the case that a proposal must accord with each and every policy within the Development Plan.

The proposed alterations are considered acceptable in terms of exterior design within the surrounding context, the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers, the highways impact and would not increase the risk of flooding on site. The proposal therefore accords with Policies DP1, DP21, DP26, DP29 and DP41 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Decision:       Permission

Case Officer: Stefan Galyas