

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/1806	Case Officer:	Tracie Axford
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Single storey side extension		
Site:	39 Brookway, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 0LN, , , ,		
Validation Date	23 Jul 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	7 Oct 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	12 Oct 2026
Target Date:	17 Sep 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Tracie Axford</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/26/1806

39 Brookway, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 0LN, , ,
Single storey side extension
Mr And Mrs Robinson

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Drainage Engineer: *"Following a review of the submitted information and due to the site, size, location, and type of development we have no objection on surface water and drainage grounds. We would recommend the following informatives are attached to any approval of the above application:*

Informative 1: The applicant must follow the drainage hierarchy of preference. Due to the size and location of the development, an infiltration test should be carried out in accordance with the Part H2, paragraph 1.34 to 1.37 of the Building Regulations

(https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a80cf9ded915d74e33fc8ae/BR_PDF_AD_H_2015.pdf). This rate should then be put into the calculation in Part H3, paragraph 3.28. Following this the applicant can use the free tools at <https://www.uksuds.com/> to size the soakaway for the 1 in 100 (1%) plus CC event.

If infiltration fails, the same links should be used to size attenuation storage to ensure surface water runoff does not increase from the existing discharge rate.

To obtain the relevant rainfall data the applicant can visit <https://fehweb.ceh.ac.uk/> to download the point data for their site and input the csv file into the tools above.

Informative 2: We have identified the site is adjacent to a surface water flood risk, therefore appropriate flood resistance and resilience measures should be considered within the development.

BURGESS HILL TOWN COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

The Committee of 5th October would Recommend Refusal, the amended site plan has not given any additional information regarding the separation of the premise and resultant impact on the green space. There remains insufficient information for the committee to make a positive recommendation.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for a proposed single storey side extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

There is no relevant planning history for this site.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site comprises a semi-detached two-storey dwelling situated on a corner plot within an established residential area. The property is constructed of red brick with areas of rendered finish beneath a pitched tiled roof. The dwelling is set back from the highway behind an open front garden laid predominantly to lawn and enclosed by a low post-and-rail style boundary treatment.

The side boundary is enclosed by close-boarded timber fencing. The surrounding area is characterised by residential dwellings comprising a mix of semi-detached and detached dwellings of a similar scale, design and materials. Properties are generally set within spacious plots with landscaped front gardens and mature trees and planting contributing positively to the verdant character of the locality.

The site is located within the built up area of Burgess Hill

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposal seeks permission for a single-storey side extension. It will extend approximately 2.8 metres beyond the existing side elevation into the area which is currently open space. It is proposed that the extension will have a pitched tiled roof with a maximum height of 3.3 metres. Two windows are proposed to the side elevation, one of which will be obscure glazed. External materials proposed will match the existing dwelling.

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 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

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.

Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan

The Burgess Hill Neighbourhood plan was made in 2016.

There are no relevant policies.

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:

DPS1 - Climate Change

DPS2 - Sustainable Design and Construction

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) (August 2026)

ASSESSMENT

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

- Design and Character
- Impact on neighbouring properties
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Design and Character

Policy DP26 of the District Plan relates to character and design and requires all proposals, including alterations and extensions, to be well designed. However, this policy has 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 of the NPPF 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 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 typically use simple, uncomplicated building forms to complement and coordinate with the scale, form and massing of the original dwelling.

Principle DG50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide states: *'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 extension would be set back from both the principal front elevation and the rear elevation, ensuring that it remains visually subordinate to the original dwelling. The proposed external materials would match those of the existing dwelling and surrounding residential development, providing a cohesive appearance and ensuring that the extension integrates satisfactorily with the character of the property and the wider area. Overall, the proposal is considered to represent a sympathetic form of development that would respect the scale, appearance and character of the host dwelling and the surrounding streetscene.

Whilst the extension would reduce the visual gap currently present to the side of the dwelling, a substantial area of open frontage and corner plot landscaping would remain. The development would therefore not undermine the spacious character of the streetscene or result in the loss of an important visual gap.

The proposal would also involve the removal of a short section of existing boundary fencing and the retention of the remaining fencing along the side boundary. The works are therefore not considered to result in any material harm to the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area.

The proposals are therefore considered acceptable in terms of design, form and scale and comply with policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan.

Impact on neighbouring properties

Policy DP26 in part seeks to ensure that new development does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings. It is considered that this policy has very limited weight as it is materially inconsistent with the NPPF and consideration should be given to policies L2 and P3 of the NPPF.

Policy L2 of the NPPF relates to making effective use of land. Part L2(1dii) 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 relates to living conditions and pollution. Part 2(b) of this policy requires proposals *'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'*.

The proposed side extension is not considered to result in any unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. The application site occupies a corner plot and the extension would be positioned adjacent to the side boundary facing the open street scene rather than in close proximity to neighbouring habitable room windows or private amenity areas. By virtue of its single-storey scale, modest footprint and siting, the development would not give rise to harmful overbearing impacts, loss of outlook, overshadowing or loss of light to adjoining properties. Furthermore, no windows are proposed that would result in overlooking or a material loss of privacy.

It is therefore considered that the proposal will not result in any unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in terms of light, loss of outlook, overbearing impact or privacy. In view of the above, the proposed development is considered to have an acceptable impact upon neighbouring amenities, thereby complying with District Plan policy DP26 and NPPF policies L2 and P3.

Other Matters

The comments of the Town Council, including concerns relating to the boundary treatment, have been carefully considered. Whilst the proposal would result in the side extension projecting beyond the existing line of the boundary fence, the submitted plans indicate that the majority of the fencing would remain in its current position, with only a short section being removed to facilitate the development. Given the single-storey scale of the extension, its set-back from the principal elevation, and its location alongside the existing side boundary, it is not considered that the proposal would appear unduly prominent or result in harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. As such, your planning officer does not concur with the Town Council's concerns in this respect and consider the proposal to remain acceptable in design terms.

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

The proposals are deemed acceptable in terms of design, and would not cause significant harm to neighbouring amenities. Therefore, the proposal complies with policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policies DP3, L2 and P3 of the NPPF and the relevant principles of the Mid Sussex Design Guide.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Tracie Axford