

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/1539	Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas
Application Type:	Full Application		
Proposal:	Erection of proposed 2 bedroom chalet bungalow.		
Site:	The Coach House, 95C London Road, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 8NE, , ,		
Validation Date	24 Jun 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	27 Jul 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	5 Aug 2026
Target Date:	19 Aug 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:	7 Aug 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/1539

**The Coach House, 95C London Road, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 8NE, ,
Erection of proposed 2 bedroom chalet bungalow.
Mr Kazem Hossini**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

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

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

West Sussex County Council Highways: *'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.'*

Mid Sussex District Council Drainage: Recommend approval, subject to conditions.

Ecology: No objection.

Mid Sussex District Council Street Naming and Numbering: *' Please can you ensure that the street naming and numbering informative is added to any decision notice granting approval in respect of the planning applications listed below as these applications will require address allocation if approved.'*

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Town Council: *'The Committee of 13th July would Recommend Approval.'*

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for the development of a detached, two storey, two bedroom dwelling.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

09/01341/FUL - Demolition of existing coach house and erection of detached dwelling. Refusal 31.07.2009.
-Appeal allowed AP/09/0078

DM/26/0342 - Proposed two-storey extension to existing dwelling at 95C London Road. Permission 01.04.2026.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The proposal relates to The Coach House, a two-storey detached dwelling set to the western side of the highway. The dwelling is provided access through a gravelled driveway which cuts through between No.93 and 95 London Road. There is existing garden amenity space set to the north of the dwelling which includes both a patio and grassed area. The existing dwelling features a pitched roof and in terms of external materials, the existing dwelling is composed of multi-brickwork in running bond laid on mortar beds, plain clay roof tiles, white uPVC casement windows, a black uPVC front door and a white uPVC French door.

The site is located within the built-up area for Burgess Hill.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposal would develop a new detached, two storey, two bedroom dwelling immediately to the east of the existing Coach House. The proposed dwelling would measure at approximately 9.4m in length, 6.8m wide, 4.2m high to the eaves and 6.5m high to the ridge. The proposed dwelling would be composed of stock facing brickwork to the external walls, plain concrete roof tiles, white uPVC windows, a black composite front door and a white uPVC French door to the rear.

The proposal would allocate two spaces for parking immediately to the east with an electric vehicle charger and planters partially wrapping around this area. Further hard landscaping would be carried out to the rear patio which would utilise concrete paving.

The existing dwelling at 95C would have its existing front porch demolished and removed. In its place a proposed lean to canopy would be constructed above the front door.

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) Any 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 (MSDP), Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) and the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan (BHNP).

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:

DP4: Housing

DP5: Planning to Meet Future Housing Need
DP6: Settlement Hierarchy
DP17: Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC)
DP21: Transport
DP26: Character and Design
DP27: Dwelling Space Standards
DP28: Accessibility
DP29: Noise, Air and Light Pollution
DP38: Biodiversity
DP39: Sustainable Design and Construction
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.

Neighbourhood Plan

The Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan was made on the 28th January 2016, the relevant policies are considered to be:

Policy S4 - Parking Standards for New Developments

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 hearings were concluded on 19th March 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
DPS4 - Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage
DPN6 - Pollution
DPN7- Noise Impacts
DPB1 - Character and Design
DPT4 - Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure
DPH1 - Housing
DPH3 - Sustainable Development Inside the Built-Up Area
DPH11 - Dwelling Space Standards
DPH12 - Accessibility

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, 9, 11, 12, 39, 48, 115-117, 131, 134, 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/Code

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.

Technical Housing Standards - Nationally Described Space Standards (March 2015)

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
- Impact on the Future Occupants of the Development
- Flood Risk and Drainage
- Highways and Parking
- Ecology
- Sustainability
- Ashdown Forest
- Biodiversity Net Gain
- Planning Balance and Conclusion

Principle:

Using this as the starting point the development plan in Mid Sussex consists of the adopted District Plan, Site Allocation DPD, and the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan.

As the proposed development is within the built up area of Burgess Hill, a Category 1 settlement, the principle of additional windfall housing development is acceptable under Policy DP6 of the District Plan which states:

'Development will be permitted within towns and villages with defined built-up area boundaries. Any infilling and redevelopment will be required to demonstrate that it is of an appropriate nature and scale (with particular regard to DP26: Character and Design), and not cause harm to the character and function of the settlement.'

The principle of developing a single new build dwelling within a defined settlement boundary is considered to be acceptable, owing to the site's sustainable location. It is however also necessary to consider other planning issues in order to determine the overall planning balance.

Impact on Character and Design

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'*

In relation to the height and scale of new buildings, Principle DG39 of the Design Guide notes:

'The scale of new buildings should relate to their context (rural or urban), their location within the hierarchy of routes and whether they act as a focal point, landmark or corner building and the topography of a site.'

The proposed dwelling would be sited within the existing yard behind the terraces on London Road to the east with access provided between No.93 and 95. Some glimpsed public views may be offered from the access to the east as well as from London Road when looking towards the south-west from past the garage to the north.

In terms of the proposed dwellings footprint, this would be notably lower than that of the existing dwelling at 95C. The proposal would utilise a barn hipped roof with front pitched dormers at roof level. Whilst this would not directly reflect the design of 95C, it is considered that the use of matching facing materials such as facing brickwork walls and plain concrete roof tiles would help the proposed dwelling assimilate in with its surroundings.

The proposed dwelling would be set to the north of the existing yard with 95C set to the west. The rear elevation of the proposal would be set in line with the rear of 95C and would largely reflect the layout of the extant permission granted to extend the neighbouring dwelling under DM/26/0342 at two storey level. It is considered that the proposed length and width would allow for the dwelling to be sited without appearing overly cramped within its context. Whilst the proposed plot form would be smaller than that of 95C, it is noted that other smaller plots exist within the immediate locality, including at the terrace immediately to the east along London Road. Furthermore, the offset of 1.2m from 95C coupled with the bespoke design features would allow for the proposed dwelling to be read as a detached property rather than simply an extension.

It is considered that the siting of the proposed dwelling perpendicular to 95C would allow for the existing yard arrangement to still be appreciated. The two dwellings would form the outer peripheries alongside their associated parking areas.

In light of the above, the proposed development is considered to result in an acceptable impact with regard to the character and appearance of the locality. The proposal would therefore accord with the provisions of DP26 of the MSDP.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenities

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states (in part):

'All applicants will be required to demonstrate 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 Policy DP29).'

There is an existing secondary ground floor window at 95C which serves a living room which would face out towards the proposed dwelling. 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 "25 degree approach" should be taken whereby a 25 degree line is drawn from the centre of the lowest habitable room. If the neighbouring properties window lies beneath the 25 degrees as measured, then the building will not 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.

Despite the 1.2m offset from 95C the existing living room window would fail the 25 degree test. Accordingly, the window would receive less light than the current arrangement and this would likely be most notable during the morning hours. However, the living room at the neighbouring dwelling is also served by an existing north facing window and translucent patio door. It is therefore considered that sufficient light would continue to be received through these other openings.

The proposed dwelling would include two rooflights at roof level which would serve a landing and a bathroom. Similarly the aforementioned extant permission proposed two rooflights to the northern roof slope and it was found within the previous Officer Report that these opening would supply light rather than outlook and therefore would not give rise to a significant overlooking impact. The proposed kitchen window and living room double door at ground floor level are not considered to give rise to a significant amount of overlooking due as views towards the neighbouring site would be obscured by boundary fencing.

To the principal elevation, there would be two first floor primary bedroom windows. These would look out towards the yard as well as garage and outbuilding to the south. There are two existing unobscured glazed dormer windows at 95A and B as well as an unobscured glazed windows at ground floor level. It is considered that the proposed dormer windows would not result in direct overlooking of neighbouring properties, as the dwellings would be arranged at an angle to one another such that any views obtained would be oblique rather than direct.

Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed development would result in an acceptable impact with regard to neighbouring amenities and would comply with the provisions of DP26 and DP29 of the MSDP.

Impact on the Future Occupiers of the Development

Policy DP27 of the District Plan states that all new residential development should comply with minimum nationally described space standards for internal floor space and storage.

A minimum floor area of 70m² with 2m² of built in storage is recommended for a two storey, two-bedroom dwelling with three bed spaces. The gross internal floor area of circa 72m² would go beyond the requirements of the space standards and would meet the built in storage requirements.

To the rear of the property, some garden amenity space would be provided which would comprise of a patio and grassed section. The total area would measure at approximately 23m². Although this would be a small area and less than the ground floor area of the dwelling itself, the area would provide a necessary private amenity area for any future occupiers use. As found within the character and appearance section of the report, within the sites locality, smaller gardens are not considered to be uncommon. It is therefore considered that on balance that this area would be sufficient to meet the needs of the future occupiers of the site.

The proposal is considered to meet the requirements of the Technical Housing Standards and would comply with DP27 of the MSPD.

Flood Risk and Drainage

Policy 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.'

The application site is located within flood zone 1 and therefore has a low probability of flooding. Within the submitted Drainage Assessment, it was noted that the new proposed dwelling would utilise a soakaway with further attenuation to be used in a tank below the parking area, should this be required and subject to detailed design. Furthermore, it is intended that the foul water is disposed into the existing foul mains infrastructure.

In response to the proposed development, the Council's Drainage Engineer consultant commented that the approval of the application was recommended subject to pre-commencement conditions requiring details of surface and foul water sewage as well as the maintenance and management of the sustainable drainage scheme. These conditions have been agreed with by the Applicant prior to the applications determination.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to result in an acceptable drainage impact and would accord with the provisions of DP41 of the MSDP.

Highways and Parking

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.

Furthermore, Policy S4 of the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan states among other matters that:

'In cases where planning permission is necessary for alterations and extensions to properties support will not be given for the conversion of garage space to habitable rooms/ residential use unless there is adequate space to park cars off street in line with the parking standards.'

In terms of the site's locality, London Road to the east is a B classified road and subject to a 30 mile an hour speed limit with access provided to the yard through a gap between numbers 93 and 95. The proposal is located within Burgess Hill Dunstall parking behaviour zone which requires 2 allocated parking spaces to be demonstrated for two bedroom properties as set out in the West Sussex County Council Parking Standards.

The proposed development would include two allocated parking spaces immediately to the east of the dwelling. Furthermore, bicycle parking would be provided within a bike store. It was commented by the

Highways Engineer that the proposal was not considered to result in a material intensification of the use of the existing access. It was concluded that the scheme would not result in a severe highways impact nor give rise to any immediate highway safety concerns. Conditions requiring adherence to the proposed site layout in terms of car and bicycle parking were recommended. These conditions are considered to be relevant and necessary should permission be granted in order to ensure that this space continues to provide satisfactory parking provision.

It is considered that the proposal would result in an acceptable highways impact and would comply with DP21 of the MSDP and Policy S4 of the BHNP.

Ecology

Policy DP38 of the District Plan seeks to protect and enhance biodiversity by ensuring that development:

'Contributes and takes opportunities to improve, enhance, manage and restore biodiversity and green infrastructure, so that there is a net gain in biodiversity, including through creating new designated sites and locally relevant habitats, and incorporating biodiversity features within developments; and
o Protects existing biodiversity, so that there is no net loss of biodiversity. Appropriate measures should be taken to avoid and reduce disturbance to sensitive habitats and species. Unavoidable damage to biodiversity must be offset through ecological enhancements and mitigation measures (or compensation measures in exceptional circumstances); and
o Minimises habitat and species fragmentation and maximises opportunities to enhance and restore ecological corridors to connect natural habitats and increase coherence and resilience; and
o Promotes the restoration, management and expansion of priority habitats in the District; and
o Avoids damage to, protects and enhances the special characteristics of internationally designated Special Protection Areas, Special Areas of Conservation; nationally designated Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty; and locally designated Sites of Nature Conservation Importance, Local Nature Reserves and Ancient Woodland or to other areas identified as being of nature conservation or geological interest, including wildlife corridors, aged or veteran trees, Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, and Nature Improvement Areas.'

A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal was submitted within the applications supporting documents. This document notes that there are no buildings and no trees within the area of the proposed dwelling and its associated curtilage. Accordingly, the Ecologist consultant noted within their consultation response that no survey for bats would be required. Nevertheless, a condition requiring a biodiversity enhancement strategy to be submitted prior to works above slab level are considered to be relevant and necessary should permission be granted in order to use the opportunity to enhance on site biodiversity in accordance with DP38 of the District Plan.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed development would result in an acceptable impact with regard to ecology and would accord with Policy DP38 of the District Plan.

Sustainability

Policy DP39 of the District Plan relates to Sustainable Design and Construction and requires development proposals to improve the sustainability of development. It states:

'All development proposals must seek to improve the sustainability of development and should where appropriate and feasible according to the type and size of development and location, incorporate the following measures:
- Minimise energy use through the design and layout of the scheme including through the use of natural lighting and ventilation,
- Explore opportunities for efficient energy supply through the use of communal heating networks where viable and feasible,
- Use renewable sources of energy,
- Maximise efficient use of resources, including minimising waste and maximising recycling/re-use of materials through both construction and occupation,
- Limit water use to 110 litres/person/day in accordance with Policy DP42: Water Infrastructure and the Water Environment,

- Demonstrate how the risks associated with future climate change have been planned for as part of the layout of the scheme and design of its buildings to ensure its longer term resilience'

The application is supported by a Planning and Sustainability Statement which notes that the proposal will make use of a number of measures to improve its overall sustainability. The proposal would recycle materials throughout construction including the retention of aggregate to be used as hardcore. The proposal would utilise insulation throughout to reduce the dwellings energy demand, use efficient aerated shower heads, dual flush toilets and rainwater harvesting.

Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed development will be compliant with Policy DP39 of the District Plan.

Ashdown Forest

Under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (the 'Habitats Regulations'), the competent authority - in this case, Mid Sussex District Council - has a duty to satisfy itself that any plans or projects that they regulate (including plan making and determining planning applications) are not likely to have a significant effect on a European site of nature conservation importance. For most developments in Mid Sussex, the European sites of focus are the Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ashdown Forest Special Area of Conservation (SAC). Planning permission cannot be granted by the District Council where the likelihood of significant effects exists. The main issues are recreational disturbance on the SPA and atmospheric pollution on the SAC, particularly arising from traffic emissions.

The application site is outside of the 7km zone of influence and thus there would be no effect on the SPA from recreational disturbance.

Increased traffic emissions as a consequence of new development may result in atmospheric pollution on Ashdown Forest. The main pollutant effects of interest are acid deposition and eutrophication by nitrogen deposition. High levels of nitrogen may detrimentally affect the composition of an ecosystem and lead to loss of species.

The proposed development was modelled in the Mid Sussex Transport Study (Updated Transport Analysis) as a windfall scheme such that its potential effects are incorporated into the overall results of the transport model, which indicates there would not be an overall impact on Ashdown Forest. This means that there is not considered to be a significant in combination effect on the Ashdown Forest SAC by this development proposal.

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 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.

National planning policy states that planning should be genuinely plan-led. Planning decisions should therefore be in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Weighing in favour of the scheme is that the development will provide 1 additional unrestricted residential unit where an existing residential use exists within the settlement boundary of a Category 1 settlement as defined by the District Plan. The proposal is also considered to provide benefits through the creation of construction jobs through the development phase and a new homes bonus.

The Council has performed excellently in respect of the Housing Delivery Test, a new standard method formula was published alongside the NPPF which gives Mid Sussex a significantly higher housing requirement than the current District Plan. As a result, and having regard for the need for an appropriate buffer, the Council is unable to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites as per the requirements of paragraph 78 of the NPPF. Given this shortcoming in meeting the five year housing supply target, the addition of a new dwelling is considered to help contribute an additional site, albeit making a marginal contribution. This contribution nonetheless is considered to weigh in favour of the development proposal.

The proposal is considered to have a neutral impact in respect to a number of issues such as design, neighbouring amenity, highways impact, flood risk, ecology, sustainability and the impact upon the Ashdown Forest SAC.

For the reasons set out within the assessment section, it is considered that the application complies with Policies DP4, DP5, DP6, DP17, DP21, DP26, DP27, DP28, DP29, DP38, DP39 and DP41 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and Policy S4 of the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan, the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD, the West Sussex County Council's Guidance on Parking at New Development, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Technical Housing Standards.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Stefan Galyas