

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/0839	Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed single storey wrap around extension. Two storey side and front extension		
Site:	13 Newlands Park, Copthorne, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 3EW, , ,		
Validation Date	27 Mar 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	24 Apr 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	19 May 2025
Target Date:	22 May 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Stefan Galyas</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	19 May 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/0839

**13 Newlands Park, Copthorne, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 3EW, ,
Proposed single storey wrap around extension. Two storey side and front extension
Mrs Nikki Ford**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

There were no letters of representation received in response to the proposed development.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

None received.

WORTH PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Defer to officer.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for the development of a single storey wrap around extension, a two-storey side extension and a front extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

There is no recent history of any planning applications relating to the site.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application relates to 13 Newlands Park, a two storey detached dwelling set to the western side of the road. The existing dwelling features a pitched roof type with single storey flat roofed elements which protrude from the front (east), side (south) and rear (west). The dwelling is set back from the highway edge by a front driveway space to the east and is afforded ample garden amenity space to the rear in a linear plot form. The existing dwelling is composed of brick exterior walls, a tiled roof and white uPVC windows.

With regard to the sites locality, there are a number of other residential detached dwellings set to both sides of the highway. Tile hanging is regularly featured at first floor level to provide visual interest throughout the street scene.

The site is not set within any defined settlement boundary in terms of policy constraints.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposed single storey wrap around element at single storey level would connect the single storey rear (western) elevation flat roofed projection and the single storey flat roofed side (southern) element. The extension would therefore wrap around the existing dwellings south-western corner and measure at approximately 6m in maximum length, 7.6m wide and 2.8m high. The extension would be constructed of matching brickwork walls, a mineral felt flat roof and white uPVC windows.

With regard to the proposed two storey side extension, this would run parallel to the original dwellings two storey section and would be sited to the side (southern) elevation. The extension would measure at circa 10m in length, 3.8m wide, have an eaves height of 5m and a ridge height of 6.6m high. The extension would likely feature tile hanging to the walls, a tiled roof and uPVC windows.

Both a two storey and single storey front extension would be erected as part of the development proposal. The proposed single storey element would measure at around 3.8m in length, 5.5m in maximum length and 2.7m high. The single storey front extension would use matching brickwork walls, a mineral felt flat roof and white uPVC windows. As for the proposed two storey front extension, this would measure at approximately 3.7m in length, 6.3m wide, have an eaves height of 5m and a ridge height of 7.1m. The proposal would use matching brickwork walls at ground floor level and tile hanging at first floor, a tiled roof and white uPVC 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 the 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:

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

Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan (Made June 2021)

The Relevant Policies:

CNP1.1 Character and Distinctiveness

CNP1.2 Local Amenities

CNP1.6 Household Extensions

Mid Sussex District Plan 2021-2039 Consultation Draft

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 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

DPS2 - Sustainable Design and Construction

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) (December 2024)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 is a material consideration. Paragraphs 2, 8, 11, 39, 48, 115-117, 131, 135 & 139.

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 Amenities
- Highways Impact
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Design and Character

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'*

Policy CNP1.6 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan states that:

Extensions to existing buildings will be supported provided they adhere to other policies in the development plan and:

- (a) Are no higher than the existing building.*
- (b) Do not conflict with traditional boundary treatment of an area.*
- (c) Use materials which are compatible with materials of existing/ surrounding buildings*

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.'

Additionally, Principle DG50 as set out within the Design Guide, relates to front extensions:

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.

Principle DG50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide elaborates further on what constitutes 'good design' in relation to side extensions:

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.

In terms of rear extensions, principle DG51 states:

'Rear extensions which are not visible from the street and do not negatively impact on neighbouring properties can be expressed in many forms, including by adopting a contemporary architectural approach. With reference to DG49, they should nevertheless 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 sites locality is made up of a number of other residential properties which appear to have been altered and extended in varying forms. The neighbouring property to the south displays a double gabled appearance whilst other dwellings use alternative layouts and designs.

The proposed two storey extension would increase the buildings overall bulk and scale and would display a double gable to the roadside. The additional gable added through the proposed extension would be offset from the principal elevation, allowing this element to be read as a later addition of site. Furthermore, the proposed ridge height would be offset from the original dwellings two storey element, further increasing the extensions subservience. It is considered that the double gable appearance would not appear overly out of context given the design at the nearby property to the south at No.12.

With regard to the proposed front first floor extension, a pitched roof design would be utilised and continue the original dwellings two storey pitch through to the front. As such, this element would not clearly appear subservient towards the host dwelling. However, it is considered that the use of matching materials would help this extension assimilate into the existing. As such, it is not considered that this element would give rise to an overly incongruous appearance.

The proposed ground floor front extension would continue the existing flat roof outshot to the side and connect this to the main dwelling. Furthermore, the proposed wrap around extension to the dwellings south-western corner would all be contained to a single storey size and scale. It is therefore considered that both of these elements would appear subservient towards the host dwelling.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy DP26 of the District Plan, Policy CNP1.6 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant principles of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenities

Policy CNP1.2 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan states that proposals should not cause 'unacceptable harm' to neighbours amenity whereas policy DP26 of the MSDP states that development 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. There is therefore some conflict between the District Plan and Neighbourhood Plan in this respect. 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. As such, policy CNP1.2 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan is considered to take precedence and therefore the test in this instance is whether the development causes 'unacceptable harm' to neighbouring amenities as outlined above.

The proposal would include several new window opening to the side (northern) elevation which would face back towards the neighbouring property at No.14. These windows would serve a kitchen and ensuite at ground floor level and an ensuite at first floor level. Given the close proximity to the neighbouring site, a condition ensuring that these proposed windows remain obscure glazed in perpetuity is considered relevant and necessary in the interest of neighbouring amenities. The same assessment can be applied towards the proposed side (southern) elevation window which would face towards the existing neighbouring side window at No.12.

The existing dwellings overall size and scale would be increased through the addition of the first floor side and front extensions. The proposed front extension would be set approximately 6m away from No.14 to the north which has an existing ground floor window set behind a single storey garage. In terms of light impact to the rear windows, Principle DG47 of the Design Guide states among other matters that all dwellings should benefit from daylight and sunlight levels that conform to BRE (Better Regulation Executive) standards. Further guidance is set out within the "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice" document. The "45 degree approach" should be taken whereby a 45 degree line is drawn from the top of the elevation and a second 45 degree line is taken from the end of the projection. If the neighbouring properties window lies within the centre of both lines, then the building will likely cause a significant reduction in light received to the concerned window. This guidance is taken as a rule of thumb and each planning application is assessed based on its own merits.

When the neighbouring window is assessed against the 45 degree test, by virtue of the significant offset, the extension would pass the test both in elevation and plan format. As such, it is not considered that the neighbouring window would receive a significantly lower amount of light due to the proposed first floor extension. As for No.12 to the south, there is an existing first floor window which would not likely experience a significant loss of light when the same test is applied but with a 25 degree test as the window would be opposite to the extension. As for the neighbouring side (northern) facing windows, these are considered to already experience a reduced level of light and serve a bathroom and hallway. As such, the proposed two storey side extension is not considered to give rise to a significant overbearing impact towards the neighbouring occupiers.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered to comply with the provisions of DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and Policy CNP1.2 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood 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.

A four bedroom property in Copthorne and Worth would be required to demonstrate 3 off-road parking spaces. The proposed development would convert the existing store into a integral garage space, measuring at approximately 6.2m in length and 2.1m wide. These dimensions would likely fall short of the requirements as set out within the Manual for Streets and cannot be factored in as an off-road parking space.

A four-bedroom property in Haywards Heath Bentswood would be required to demonstrate 3 off road parking spaces. The proposed development would convert the existing garage space into habitable accommodation. It is considered that the existing integral garage is of a limited size, measuring at approximately 5.4m in length and 1.8m at the narrowest point. It is therefore considered that the existing

garage would fall short of the measurements required for an internal garage as set out within the Manual for Streets. Whilst the site cannot demonstrate three off road parking spaces, it is not considered that it would be reasonable to refuse the proposal on this basis and that some unrestricted roadside parking would be offered along Newlands Park.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would result in an acceptable impact with regard to highways and accord with Policy DP21 of the District plan.

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 is appropriate in terms of design, will not negatively impact on the host dwelling nor its immediate setting, will not harm neighbouring amenities and result in an acceptable highways impact.

The proposal will comply with Policies DP21 and DP26 of the District Plan, Policies CNP1.1, CNP1.2 and CNP1.6 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan, the MSDC Design Guide and the requirements of the NPPF.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Stefan Galyas