

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/0076	Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Single Storey Extension		
Site:	13 Fairlawn Crescent, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 1NX, , , ,		
Validation Date	13 Jan 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	6 Feb 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Refusal	Recommendation Date:	2 Mar 2026
Target Date:	10 Mar 2026	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:	3 Mar 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/0076

**13 Fairlawn Crescent, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 1NX, , ,
Single Storey Extension
Mrs Fiona Fox**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

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

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

None received.

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Town Council: No comment.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing single storey garage as well as the rear verandah and for the development of a single storey side and rear extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

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

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application relates to 13 Fairlawn Crescent, a detached bungalow which features a hipped roof form and is set to the western side of the road. The property is set back from the highway edge by a front (east) garden and a low brick built front boundary wall. Access to the site is provided through a part tarmacked, part gravelled front driveway. To the rear of the dwelling there is a single storey pitched roof garage outbuilding and further garden amenity space is set to the rear (west) of the dwelling. The existing dwelling is composed of facing brickwork and rendered walls, plain concrete roof tiles, white uPVC windows and doors

There are a number of other detached and semi-detached bungalows in terms of the sites locality. Several dwellings utilise a similar appearance to the application dwelling and visual interest is added throughout the street scene to the respective dwellings exteriors with some properties using a render finish whilst other utilise brickwork exteriors.

With regard to policy constraints, the site is located within the East Grinstead built up area.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposed development would demolish the existing single storey rear garage outbuilding and rear verandah. Partly in its place, a new single storey side and rear extension would be developed. The proposed extension would have a maximum length of circa 11m, measure at 4.3m wide, 2.4m high to the eaves and 4.4m high to the ridge when measured from the highest adjacent ground floor level. Proposed external materials would comprise brickwork, render and hardie plank boarding to the walls, plain concrete roof tiles, matching white uPVC windows, a double glazed door and a velux rooflight.

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 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

East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan (Made November 2016)

Relevant Policies:

Policy EG3 - Promoting Good Design

Policy EG12 - Car Parking

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 EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan seeks to promote good design through the following measures:

- a) The form of the proposed development is proportionate and in keeping with the scale, height, materials and site coverage of the surrounding area;*
- b) The layout of the proposed development respects the topography and character of the site, protects important landscape features and does not harm adjoining amenity;*
- c) The proposal does not result in the loss of buildings or spaces that would have an unacceptable impact on the character of the area;*
- d) The proposal ensures satisfactory means of access for vehicles and pedestrians and provides adequate parking, cycle storage and refuse facilities on site;*
- e) The design of new buildings and the layout of spaces, including footways, car and cycle parking areas, should be permeable and provide connectivity with neighbouring areas;*
- f) New development must be inclusive and where appropriate make satisfactory provision for the safe and easy access for those with mobility impairment; and*
- g) The design of new developments must result in the creation of a safe and secure environment and incorporate adequate security measures and features to deter crime, fear of crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour; and*
- h) Proposals make provision for green infrastructure and biodiversity enhancement..*

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.'

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 existing dwelling appears to have previously been extended to the rear through a single storey verandah which is of an overall modest size and scale. Both the existing verandah and the detached garage are considered to be of limited architectural merit, with the verandah using uPVC throughout whilst the garage is clad in a pebble dash exterior.

The existing bungalow is considered to be of an overall modest size in footprint and its overall bulk and massing is considered to be limited by the use of the hipped roof form.

The proposed extension would in effect wrap around the dwellings south-western corner and would have a maximum length of 11m. This length would be almost a duplication of the existing dwellings maximum length which measures at circa 12.3m when taken from the front bay measured to the rear elevation. The wrapping around effect is discouraged within the design guide as elaborated under Figure 9E in association with Principle DG49: *'Extensions that wrap around an existing dwelling can undermine the integrity of the original architecture.'*

There would be an offset in height from the existing bungalow and the proposed extension would utilise a comparable height to the existing front bay projection. Furthermore, the proposed development would use matching exterior materials to help assimilate with the existing. However, due to the significant footprint of the proposal, the extension is considered to lack subservience towards the existing modest bungalow.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed rear and side extension would not be of a subservient footprint or scale to the existing bungalow. The proposal would likely appear overly large and discordant in the context of the existing. As such, the proposal would fail to comply with the provisions of DP26 of the District Plan, EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan and principles DG49, DG50 and DG51 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenities

In terms of impact upon neighbouring amenities, Policy DP26 of the District Plan 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);'

When considering impact upon neighbouring amenity, policy DP26 of the District Plan states that development 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. Policy EG3 of the Neighbourhood Plan states that the development should not harm amenity.

In cases where there is a discrepancy between District and Neighbourhood Plan policies, legislation states that greater weight should be given to the Plan (and policy) that has been adopted at a later date. In this instance the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan was made in November 2016 and the Mid Sussex District Plan adopted in March 2018. As such, it is considered that greater weight should be given to the District Plan policy, DP26, with the test being whether the proposal would result in significant harm to neighbouring amenities.

The proposed development would introduce a new more substantial element of built form within a close proximity to the shared boundary with No.11 to the south. The proposed extension would be set circa 0.5m away from the shared boundary and would present an expanse of blank elevation within a close proximity to the neighbouring site. At present there is a boundary wall and a circa close board 1.8m fence acting as the boundary treatment between the two sites.

There are several unobscured glazed rear (west) elevation windows at No.11 which have the potential to be impacted by the proposed development. 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 assessed as an estimate against the 45-degree test, the proposed extension would likely breach the 45-degree line when taken in plan format but pass when assessed in elevational form. It is noted that the proposed extension would be sited to the north of these neighbouring windows. The neighbouring windows therefore are considered to receive a limited amount of direct light from the north as existing and this is considered to be further restricted by the existing boundary fence and outbuilding at the application site. As such, it is not considered that the proposed extension would give rise to significant harm through the loss of light.

The proposal would create a new expanse of blank elevation set circa 0.5m from the shared boundary. The proposal would however be set to a single storey height and would in part replace an existing outbuilding which was already positioned within a close proximity to the shared boundary. The existing garage outbuilding measures at approximately 2m to the eaves and 3.1m in ridge height when compared to the proposed extension which would measure at 2.4m high to the eaves and 4.4m high to the ridge. This increase in size is not considered to be so substantial that a significant additional overbearing would be incurred.

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.

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

It is considered that the proposed extension would be of a significant footprint which would wrap around the existing dwelling. This proposed footprint is considered to appear overly large and discordant within the context of the existing modest bungalow. To this end, the proposed extension is considered to lack subservience towards the existing. It is therefore considered that the proposal would fail to accord with the provisions of DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Principles DG49, DG50 and DG51 of the Mid Sussex design Guide and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Decision: Refusal

Case Officer: Stefan Galyas