

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/0800	Case Officer:	Stuart Malcolm
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Alterations to the existing rear ground floor plan and the construction of a single-storey side extension, modifications to the rear elevation and the construction of a single story link building is proposed between the main dwelling and the annex.		
Site:	Rossmead, Orchard Lane, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 8QF, , ,		
Validation Date	27 Mar 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	21 Apr 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	20 Jun 2025
Target Date:	22 May 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Stuart Malcolm</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	24 Jun 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/0800

**Rossmead, Orchard Lane, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 8QF, ,
Alterations to the existing rear ground floor plan and the construction of a single-storey side extension, modifications to the rear elevation and the construction of a single story link building is proposed between the main dwelling and the annex.
Mr And Mrs P Awty**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

MSDC Drainage: No objection subject to securing flood mitigation measures outlined in submissions.

HASSOCKS PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Recommend permission is granted

INTRODUCTION

This application (DM/25/0800) seeks permission for alterations to the existing rear ground floor plan and the construction of a single-storey side extension, modifications to the rear elevation and the construction of a single storey link building is proposed between the main dwelling and the annex at Rossmead, Orchard Lane, Hassocks.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

There is no relevant planning history.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site is a two storey detached dwelling located in a suburban setting close to the centre of Hassocks village. Located off Orchard Lane, which has a semi-rural appearance, the site is opposite Adastra Park which is to the east. The surrounding properties to the south, west and north are also detached in nature.

The nearest neighbours, and those most likely to be affected by the proposals, are located just beyond the boundary to the north at 10 and 11 Wilmington Close (these being the nearest to the new side extension) to the south at Annandale and to the west at 7, 8 and 9 Wilmington Close.

Following the approach set out under the NPPF for assessing fluvial flood risk (flood zones) some of the application site is considered consistent with Flood Zone 2 (1:1000 extent).

In policy terms the site is within the built up area of Hassocks.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The Design and Access Statement describes the works as follows:

"This full planning application proposes alterations to the existing floor plans and the construction of a single-storey side extension to the north of the dwelling. The proposal includes modifications to the rear elevation, replacing existing openings with Crittall-style windows and doors, alongside potential cladding

or render to enhance the façade. Additionally, the scheme seeks to introduce a connecting hallway between the main dwelling and the annex on the south side, providing a seamless transition between the two structures. The side extension and the proposed connection between the main house and the annex will feature zinc cladding and a zinc roof with a shallow pitch of 10 degrees.

The proposed side extension will add 22.5 sqm. to the existing dwelling, contributing to an overall proposed ground floor area of 129.7 sqm. Additionally, the connection between the main house and the annex is proposed at 9.7 sqm."

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, the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and the Hassocks 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 in 2018. The most relevant policy is:

DP26 - Character and Design
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.

There are no relevant policies.

Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Plan is made so forms part of the development plan. The most relevant policies are:

Policy 4: Managing Surface Water
Policy 9: Character and 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 (Regulation 19) is currently at Examination and the 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.

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 is a material consideration. Paragraphs 8, 131, 135 and 181 (and the rest of Chapter 14) are considered to be particularly relevant to this application.

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 residential amenity;
- Flood Risk and Drainage ; and
- Biodiversity net gain.

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex 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:

- is of high quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace;*
- 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;*
- creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape;*
- protects open spaces, trees and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;*
- protects valued townscapes and the separate identity and character of towns and villages;*
- 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 DP27);*
- creates a pedestrian-friendly layout that is safe, well connected, legible and accessible;*
- incorporates well integrated parking that does not dominate the street environment, particularly where high density housing is proposed;*
- positively addresses sustainability considerations in the layout and the building design;*
- take the opportunity to encourage community interaction by creating layouts with a strong neighbourhood focus/centre; larger (300+ unit) schemes will also normally be expected to incorporate a mixed use element;*
- optimises the potential of the site to accommodate development."*

Policy 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan is a similar criteria based policy and states that:

"Development proposals will be supported where they have regard to the Hassocks Townscape Appraisal, and where their character and design takes account of the following design principles as appropriate to the nature, scale and location of the particular proposal:

- 1. Is of high quality design and layout;*
- 2. Contributes positively to the private and public realm to create a sense of place;*
- 3. Respects the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape;*
- 4. Protects open spaces and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;*
- 5. Protects valued townscapes and the separate identity and character of Hassocks, Keymer and Clayton;*

6. Does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings, including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight, sunlight and security;
7. Creates safe, accessible and well connected environments;
8. Protects existing landscape features and contributes to the village's Green Infrastructure network;
9. Incorporates the use of local materials which are appropriate to the defined Local Townscape Character Area; and
10. Positively responds to the local vernacular character of the defined Local Townscape Character Area."

The Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD also provides advice for extensions to dwellings. Principle DG49 states that:

"Extensions should respond to the design of the original dwelling and applicants will be expected to demonstrate how local character has informed the design proposal. Extensions should also normally be designed to be well-integrated with the existing scale, form and massing allowing the original building to remain the dominant element of the property whether it has one or several additions".

Principle 50 refers specifically to side extensions and 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."

In this case the size and scale of the extensions are in keeping with the existing house and the plot is large enough to comfortably accommodate the additions without appearing overly cramped. In respect of the design of the additions, the use of zinc and glazing for the appearance add a more contemporary feel to the proposals and these elements sit well alongside the existing house. The other external alterations are all considered acceptable in design and visual amenity terms. The proposals do not close an important gap or view and they wholly comply with Principles DG49 and DG50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide.

In residential amenity terms, the test of development from Policy DP26 of the District Plan is whether or not it causes 'significant harm' to neighbouring amenity. Policy 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan however refers to development not causing '*unacceptable harm*' to residents.

In residential amenity terms, the test of development here is whether or not it causes '*unacceptable harm*' to neighbouring amenity as per Policy 9. 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. The '*unacceptable harm*' test of the Neighbourhood Plan adopted in 2020 is therefore the correct test to apply in this case.

The neighbours most likely to be affected are those to the north given that the side extension is on the northern flank of the existing house. The side extension is however just single storey in height and will therefore not cause unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity by virtue of loss of light or by being overbearing. Whilst there is a new window and door in the northern elevation of the extension, these serve a utility/boot room (non-habitable) and are obviously also located at ground floor level. As such, and coupled with the boundary treatments which includes natural landscaping, the proposal will not cause unacceptable harm in respect of loss of privacy or overlooking.

The annex link will not cause unacceptable harm to any neighbours and overall the proposal falls short of the breaching the relevant policy test.

In regard to construction disruption, the applicant will be advised via informative of their responsibilities under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and the duty of care not to cause the neighbours of the site a nuisance.

Overall in residential amenity terms, the proposal accords with Policy 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Flood Risk and Drainage

Policy DP41 of the District Plan states in part that:

"Proposals for development will need to follow a sequential risk-based approach, ensure development is safe across its lifetime and not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. The District Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) should be used to identify areas at present and future flood risk from a range of sources including fluvial (rivers and streams), surface water (pluvial), groundwater, infrastructure and reservoirs.

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."

Policy 4 of the Neighbourhood Plan states that:

"Technical proposals which seek to reduce the risk of surface water flooding will be supported. Development proposals should seek to reduce existing run-off rates in the first instance.

Development proposals which incorporate sustainable drainage techniques to manage surface water will be supported. Where technically feasible sustainable drainage techniques should include infiltration measures that reflect natural drainage patterns and manage water as close to its source as possible."

Paragraph 181 of the NPPF states that:

"When determining any planning applications, local planning authorities should ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere. Where appropriate, applications should be supported by a site-specific flood-risk assessment⁶³. Development should only be allowed in areas at risk of flooding where, in the light of this assessment (and the sequential and exception tests, as applicable) it can be demonstrated that:

- a) within the site, the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons to prefer a different location;*
- b) the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient such that, in the event of a flood, it could be quickly brought back into use without significant refurbishment;*
- c) it incorporates sustainable drainage systems, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate;*
- d) any residual risk can be safely managed; and*
- e) safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan."*

The Council's Drainage team has reviewed the applicant's submissions which includes a brief Flood Risk Assessment.

The Drainage team has confirmed that:

"We have reviewed the additional information submitted as part of this application and can provide the following comments.

We have no objection to the proposed development on flood risk grounds. This is subject to the development incorporating all flood mitigation measures set out within the Flood Risk Assessment (AEG8028_BN6-Hassocks_01 Aegaea), including finished floor levels.

Due to the nature of the development (minor residential extension) drainage should be managed via Building Regulations/Control."

In light of these comments, and subject to the imposition of the requested condition relating to the proposed mitigation, it can be concluded the application complies with Policy DP41 of the District Plan, Policy 4 of the Neighbourhood Plan and 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.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the proposal is acceptable in respect of its design, the impact on neighbouring residential amenity insofar as unacceptable harm cannot be demonstrated and the risk of flooding is reduced. As such the proposal accords with the requirements of Policies DP26 and DP41 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policies 4 and 9 of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan, the Mid Sussex Design Guide and the NPPF.

The application therefore accords with the development plan and there are no material planning considerations which indicate an alternative conclusion should be reached.

Planning permission should therefore be granted.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Stuart Malcolm