

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/1215	Case Officer:	Jessica Szollosi
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Retrospective application for erection of a shed which partially covers owned car parking spaces.		
Site:	70 Sycamore Drive, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 3UL, , , ,		
Validation Date	17 Aug 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	9 Sep 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	12 Oct 2026
Target Date:	12 Oct 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Jessica Szollosi</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Steven King</i>	Date:	12 Oct 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/1215

70 Sycamore Drive, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 3UL, , ,
Retrospective application for erection of a shed which partially covers owned car parking spaces.
Mrs Sally Burchett

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

No third party letters of representation have been received from neighbouring properties.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

WSCC Highways Authority

'The Local Highway Authority does not consider that the 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.'

The full consultation response is on the case file.

EAST GRINSTEAD TOWN COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

The East Grinstead Town Council responded 'No Comment' to the first consultation, but did not respond to the second consultation. Given that the development is built and has not been altered, the Council refers to East Grinstead's response received on 13th August 2026.

INTRODUCTION

Retrospective planning permission is sought pursuant to S.73a of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, for the erection of a shed to the rear of 70 Sycamore Drive which partially covers two owned car parking spaces.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

70 Sycamore Drive is a three-bedroom end of terrace residential dwellinghouse located on a corner plot within a large residential estate in the built-up area boundary of East Grinstead.

The dwellinghouse has a brick façade, plain roof tiles and white uPVC fenestration with two allocated parking spaces at the end of the west-facing garden within a shared parking facility with a separate entrance off Sycamore Drive to the rear of the property.

The rear garden is enclosed with a close boarded timber fence on the northern and southern boundaries, with a pedestrian footpath and public highway to the south of the application site running in an east/west direction. There is availability for off-street parking in various lay-bys off Sycamore Drive in the vicinity of the application site and an absence of parking restrictions.

The shared parking within which the development is located is surrounded by residential dwellings to the east, north and west with Sycamore Drive to the south. Given that the shared parking is located to the

rear of the neighbouring properties' gardens, the majority of the gardens are screened by various sheds and outbuildings. The parking is used for the parking of vehicles and the storage of bins.

The site is surrounded by terraced residential dwellings of similar form, scale, design and materials.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Retrospective planning permission is sought pursuant to S.73a of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended, for a garden shed which has been constructed at the end of the rear garden partially covering two allocated parking spaces.

The development has been constructed with treated tongue-and-groove softwood timber and black sand roofing felt. The development measures a width of approximately 2.44 metres and a length of 3.55 metres, with a ridge height of 2.5 metres and an eaves height of 1.95 metres. There are no windows, but double timber doors are located on the east elevation opening towards the rear garden of the dwellinghouse. The garden shed is used incidental to the main dwellinghouse for the purposes of household storage.

The width of the rear garden is approximately 4.63 metres and the west elevation of the garden shed, at 3.55 metres, encloses the property at the eastern boundary, together with timber fencing measuring 0.93 metres on the southeastern boundary and 0.15 metres on the northeastern boundary. The remaining parking provision measures some 4.56 metres in width and 4.44 metres in length.

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 the East Grinstead 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 it is an important material consideration.

Mid Sussex District Plan

The District Plan was adopted at Full Council on 28th March 2018.

Relevant policy:

DP21 - Transport

DP26 - Character and Design

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.

Neighbourhood Plan

East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan (made 2016)

Relevant policy:

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 is currently at Examination with initial hearings held in February/March 2026. The Council has consulted on Main Modifications which are required to ensure the plan is legally compliant and sound with further Hearings taking place in November 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:

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)

ASSESSMENT

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

- Character and design
- Impact on neighbouring amenities
- Impact on highway safety and parking provision
- Biodiversity net gain

Character and design

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states that '*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*'. Policy EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan contains a similar ethos.

However, this is considered to have very limited weight as they are materially inconsistent with the NPPF and therefore greater weight should be given to policy DP3 of the NPPF which sets out the key principles for well-designed places. This sets out in part that proposals should respond to their context, so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets.

The Mid Sussex Design Guide seeks high quality design from all proposed development.

The development resembles a typical natural timber shed, with timber tongue-and-groove façade and black sand roofing felt. The development measures some 2.5 metres at ridge height, 3.55 metres in

length and 2.44 metres in width. It is located between the rear garden and two owned parking spaces within a shared off-street parking area, some 1.6 metres outside the residential curtilage of the property.

The development is visible from the street scene, specifically the southwestern part of Sycamore Drive as the south, west and north elevation of the shed serve as the property's boundary treatment, enclosing the rear garden. Various neighbouring properties surrounding the application site have timber sheds at the end of their rear gardens of varying form and scale and therefore the development would not be considered an incongruent addition to the site and surrounding area. The garden shed would be considered a modest development which responds to the surrounding context within which it is set and integrates into the existing site. It is, however, noted that the siting of the shed over part of the owned parking spaces is regrettable.

Overall, the development as built would be considered to accord with policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan (design and character), Policy EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan and policy DP3 of the NPPF.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenities

In terms of impact on neighbouring amenities, Policy DP26 of the District Plan states proposals should *'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 test as set out under policy EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan states that proposals should 'not harm' adjoining neighbours amenity. A similar ethos is contained within the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.

However, policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan is considered to have very limited weight as it is materially inconsistent with the NPPF and therefore greater weight should be given to policies L2 and P3 of the NPPF which sets out the key principles for living conditions and pollution.

Policy L2 of the NPPF relates to making effective use of land and Part L2(1)(d)(ii) requires proposals to have *'acceptable living standards for residents and neighbours in terms of access to daylight, sunlight, privacy and external amenity space'*.

Policy P3 of the NPPF sets out in part that proposals should *'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.'*

Given the scale, form and nature of the shed within a rear residential garden, it would not be considered to cause unacceptable adverse impacts relating to air, noise, artificial light, water, soil or other forms of pollution on or beyond the site, nor would it lead to unacceptable living standards for residents or neighbours in terms of access to daylight, sunlight, privacy and external amenity space.

As such, the development would accord with policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan (neighbouring amenity), Policy EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan and policies L2 and P3 of the NPPF.

Impact on Highway Safety and parking provision

Policy DP21 of the District Plan seeks development to provide adequate car parking taking into account accessibility of development, the type, mix and use, and the availability and opportunities for public transport. It is considered that this policy has very limited weight as it is considered to be materially inconsistent with the NPPF and therefore greater weight should be given to policies TR4 and TR6 of the NPPF.

Policy TR4 of the NPPF relates to street design, access and parking. Part TR4(1)(e) requires proposals to *'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 relates to assessing transport impacts. Policy TR6 (4) 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. This applies both during the construction phase and following completion.*'

The Local Highway Authority have commented on the planning application and would not consider the development to 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) (December 2024 NPPF), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

The development has been sited over a portion of the applicant's two owned car parking spaces, retaining both car parking spaces, but reducing the length thereof. As such, the three bedroomed dwellinghouse retains two car parking spaces in line with the WSCC parking demand for a dwellinghouse of this size.

The remaining parking provision to the rear of the shed for two vehicles is some 4.44 metres x 4.56 metres or 2.22 metres x 4.56 metres for one vehicle. The WSCC parking standards outline that 2.4 metres x 4.8 metres is sufficient space to facilitate parking for an average size vehicle. Given that the length of the parking space falls short of this by 0.24 metres, some vehicles may overhang the parking space as per the LHA's consultation response; however, there are no parking restrictions on Sycamore Drive in the vicinity of the application site and there are lay-bys providing off-street parking for larger vehicles. Furthermore, given that the off-street parking facility is accessed via a wide private entrance, slight overhanging (by approximately 0.24 metres) is unlikely to impede manoeuvring of vehicles in and out of the shared parking facility.

As such the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of highway safety and parking provision. The proposal therefore complies with policy DP21 of the District Plan and policies TR4 and TR6 of the NPPF.

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

Whilst the siting of the development is noted, the scale and nature of the development is considered to respond to the context within which it is located and integrates with the surrounding setting. Furthermore, the development is not considered to cause any unacceptable adverse impacts to the amenity of neighbouring properties or have a severe adverse impact on the transport network or an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

As such, the development is therefore considered to comply with policies DP21 and DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policies DP3, L2, P3, TR4 and TR6 of the NPPF, the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan and the Mid Sussex Design Guide and is accordingly acceptable in planning terms.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Jessica Szollosi

