

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/0318	Case Officer:	Rachel Richardson
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Construct rear full width dormer. Demolish existing rear extension and part of existing garage. Construct larger single rear storey extension.		
Site:	6 St Christophers Road, Hurstpierpoint, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9UX, , ,		
Validation Date	20 Feb 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	17 Mar 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Refusal	Recommendation Date:	15 Apr 2026
Target Date:	17 Apr 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Rachel Richardson

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	16 Apr 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/0318

**6 St Christophers Road, Hurstpierpoint, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9UX, ,
Construct rear full width dormer. Demolish existing rear extension and part of existing garage.
Construct larger single rear storey extension.
Mr James Goodsell**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

A letter of objection was received from the neighbouring property concerned about party wall issues in connection with partial demolition of the garage.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Conservation Officer: Objects on the grounds of harm to the setting of the Conservation Area.

Southern Water: Requests formal notification of any proposed demolition works prior to such works being undertaken. This could be added to any permission as an informative to the applicant.

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Recommends permission be granted.

INTRODUCTION

Permission is sought for a single storey rear and side extension, and rear dormer window.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application property is a two storey semi detached dwelling located in the south western corner of St Christophers Road which is a cul de sac. It is of brickwork and tile construction with a bay window and Juliet style window/balcony above. It is in a slightly elevated position compared to the road and its front garden is laid to lawn with its own driveway and flat roofed semi detached pair of garages shared with No. 7 St Christopher Road. These are set behind the rear elevations of the houses.

The rear garden boundary has 1.8m high close boarded fencing defining its southern perimeter and a mature well established 2m high hedgerow to the north and western boundaries.

For the purposes of planning policy the site lies within the built up area boundary and its rear boundary adjoin the Conservation Area as defined in the District Plan.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The application seeks permission for a single storey rear extension (which also extends sideways) following demolition of a single storey flat roofed rear addition and some of the garage. Also, for construction of a flat roofed rear dormer window.

The proposed flat roofed rear/side extension measures 3.9m deep (from the rear elevation) and will project from the side elevation of the existing house by 1.8m. maintaining a gap of 1m to the boundary adjoining 7 St Christophers Road. This involves partial demolition of the garage thereby reducing its size.

It would have a height of 3.2m above ground level. A ground floor existing window in the side elevation would be removed and replaced with a door.

The application also proposes conversion of the roof and construction of a flat roofed rear dormer window. The rear elevation of the proposed dormer window would be constructed directly above the rear elevation of the existing house and would extend from the sloping plane of the roof by approximately 3.7m. It would measure 5.4m in width and be built up to the roof of 5 St Christophers Road. Rooflights are proposed on the front elevation.

Materials are to match existing, including brickwork, plain concrete tiles and Upvc fenestration.

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 Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common 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
DP35 - Conservation Areas

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

Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan was made on 19 March 2015.

Relevant policies:

Policy HurstC4 Conservation Areas

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 the 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:

DPB1: Character and Design

DPB3: Conservation Areas

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)

ASSESSMENT

The main issues for assessment are design and impact on character and appearance of the area including impact on the setting of the Conservation Area, and impact on residential amenity.

Design and Character

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.'*

The Mid Sussex Design Guide principles DG49 (general principles for extensions) 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.'

DG50: Front and side extensions 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.'

DG51: Rear Extensions states in part that,

'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.'

NPPF section 12 seeks to achieve well designed places. Para's 131 and 135 are of particular relevance. Para 135 b) states that developments should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout inter alia. C) states that development should be sympathetic to the local character including the surrounding built environment. Para 139 states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies, taking into account supplementary planning documents such as design guides.

Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states 'In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any powers under any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of conservation preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.'

DP35 states in part that:

'Development will also protect the setting of the conservation area and in particular views into and out of the area.'

NP Policy Hurst C4: Conservation Areas states that new development will be permitted where the settings of the Conservation Areas are conserved.

In terms of design and character of the proposed rear extension, it is considered that the proposed extension is acceptable and in accordance with policy criteria. The proposed ground floor plan illustrates that the proposed extension would be on the same building line and depth as the existing flat roofed extension on the other half of the pair of semi detached dwellings (No 5 St Christophers Road). There are other examples of flat roofed single storey rear extensions on nearby houses and it would not compromise the character and appearance of the property nor the streetscape. It would read as a subservient addition in comparison to the existing dwelling.

The part removal and rebuild proposed on the garage is also considered to be acceptable and not detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwelling and locality.

It is also considered that the proposed extension would conserve the special characteristics of the Conservation Area to which it backs onto. There is a mature and well established hedgerow along the rear boundary. While the Conservation Officer has noted that the width of the proposed extension is larger than the existing house and therefore not subordinate in terms of its proportions, it would be hidden in views by the existing and retained garage and therefore an objection on heritage grounds could not be sustained.

Section 6 of the MSDG refers to the design of dormer windows and that they should be positioned below the ridgeline and above the eaves and maintain a maximum area of uninterrupted roof slope. Care needs to be taken to avoid them dominating the roof.

Para's 6.3.5 and 6.3.6 state:

'While dormer windows can sometimes be prominent features in the streetscene, care needs to be taken with their design, proportions and position on the roof. The choice of design should be informed by the character and appearance of the local vernacular.'

6.3.6 Dormer windows should be visually subordinate to the roof slope, enabling a large proportion of the main roof to remain visible. Excessively wide dormers are likely to look unsatisfactory as they will often be out of proportion with the existing roof.'

DG52: Loft Conversions and roof extensions states that;

'Roof accommodation is normally reliant on dormer windows and rooflights to provide light and ventilation. However, if they are out of scale or out of character with the roofscape and proportions of a dwelling they can have an adverse impact on the character of both the dwelling and the streetscape.

The roof pitch and form are intrinsic to a building's character and roof extensions should be sensitive to this. Roof extensions and dormer windows that alter the existing ridge of the roof or significantly alter the roof profile of a building will not normally be acceptable'

The proposed dormer window is considered to represent a dominant and top heavy addition to the rear sloping plane of the roof. It would cover almost all of the sloping roof plane changing the profile of the roof and undermining the character of the original property. There are other examples of dormer windows in the locality but these are modest in comparison in terms of their proportions.

As said above the application property adjoins the Conservation area along its rear garden boundary. The Conservation Officer has commented as follows:

'The application site is an unlisted semi-detached house forming part of a development dating from the later 20th century that was constructed between Fairfield Crescent and Trinity Road, wrapping around the school playing fields. The site is not within the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area, but is within its setting, as the boundary of the Area runs along the periphery of the rear garden. The house, and the development of which it is part, are not of any particular architectural merit and make at best a neutral contribution to the setting and significance of the Conservation Area.

The current proposal is for alterations and extensions to the house comprising partial demolition of an existing detached garage to the rear of the property, a single storey rear extension replacing on an enlarged footprint an existing small addition, and a loft conversion including rear box dormer and front rooflights.

The existing rear extension and garage are not of any particular interest, and their demolition or partial demolition is not considered contentious in principle.

The principle of a replacement rear extension on an enlarged footprint is also not considered contentious, but as shown the replacement addition is wider than the existing rear elevation of the house, extending beyond it to its northern side. This would be contrary to the requirements of the District Council's adopted Design Guide in respect of an appropriate relationship of scale between the original building and additions to it, in particular Design Principle DG49 'General Principles for Extensions'. However, in terms of the impact on the setting of the Conservation Area this aspect of the proposal will have only a minor effect, as the northern end of the extension would be partly hidden in views from the west by the retained portion of the garage. In my opinion, an objection on heritage grounds to this aspect of the proposal would therefore be difficult to sustain.

Although the principle of a loft conversion would not be considered contentious, and the rooflights to the front roofslope are not considered problematic subject to detail, the proposed box dormer rear addition, which would occupy the majority of the existing rear roof slope, is considered contentious both in terms of compliance with the Design Guide, and in terms of impact on the setting of the Conservation Area.

Design Principle DG52 'Loft Conversions and Roof Extensions' of the Design Guide notes that 'Roof accommodation is normally reliant on dormer windows and rooflights to provide light and ventilation. However, if they are out of scale or out of character with the roofscape and proportions of a dwelling they can have an adverse impact on the character of both the dwelling and the streetscape.' It further states that 'The roof pitch and form are intrinsic to a building's character and roof extensions should be sensitive to this. Roof extensions and dormer windows that alter the existing ridge of the roof or significantly alter the roof profile of a building will not normally be acceptable...'

The figures to illustrate this point include 9H which shows a dormer which is less dominant within the roofslope than that proposed at 6 St Christopher's Road, but is considered unacceptable:

Sections 6.3.5-6.3.8 of this document also refer to dormer windows. 6.3.6. states that: 'Dormer windows should be visually subordinate to the roof slope, enabling a large proportion of the main roof to remain visible. Excessively wide dormers are likely to look unsatisfactory as they will often be out of proportion with the existing roof.' The proposal fails to meet this requirement due to the excessive scale and bulk of the rear box dormer.

In my opinion, the scale and form of the proposed rear roof extension would result in addition which is over scaled and overly prominent, and which detracts from the appearance of the house, including views towards it from within the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area, harming the contribution made by setting to the character and appearance of the Area.

For these reasons I would consider that the proposal in respect of the rear roof extension results in harm through impact on setting to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35. In terms of the NPPF, I would place the harm caused as falling within the less than substantial spectrum, at the lower end of that scale. The proposed extensions both at ground floor and at roof level are also both contrary to the requirements of the Council's adopted Design Guide.'

It is therefore necessary to consider whether according to Para 215 of the NPPF sufficient public benefits would offset the harm, which must be given significant importance and weight in accordance with S66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Given the private nature of the proposed residential extension, it is considered that there are no public benefits that would outweigh the harm to the setting of the Conservation Area that have been identified.

The comments made by the Conservation Officer are agreed with and as such in terms of design and impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and setting of the Conservation Area, the proposed dormer window is unacceptable and contrary to policies DP26 and DP35, the MSDG, Hurst C4 of the NP and national advice contained within the NPPF.

Residential Amenity

DP26 requires that applicants are required to demonstrate that development does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents in terms of privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight, and noise, air and light pollution.

It is not considered that the proposed development would result in significant harm to the residential amenity of nearby residents.

In terms of overlooking and a loss of privacy, depending on their design some dormer windows on the rear roofslope can be built under permitted development and are common place in a built up residential area. The view and outlook is considered similar to that which can be achieved from existing first floor windows.

In terms of daylight and sunlight the proposed extension is single storey and would not cut across the 45 degree splay when taken from the mid point of the closest neighbouring window to the extension. There is an existing extension of the same depth as that proposed at No 5, which is the other half of the pair of semi detached houses.

As such, in terms of amenity, the proposed development is considered to be compliant with relevant policy criteria.

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 recommended that permission be refused for the reasons outline above. The proposed rear dormer window is not compliant with DP26, DP35, HurstC4, the relevant MSDG principles and national policy contained within the NPPF.

Decision: Refusal

Case Officer: Rachel Richardson