

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/0452	Case Officer:	Caroline Grist
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed two-storey side and rear extension. Introduction of render to partially replace hung tile cladding at the front elevation and a new enlarged porch		
Site:	Dalby, 70 Halsford Park Road, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 1PS, , ,		
Validation Date	23 Feb 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	18 Mar 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Refusal	Recommendation Date:	17 Apr 2026
Target Date:	20 Apr 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Caroline Grist</i>

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	1
--	--	-------------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Joanne Fisher</i>	Date:	20 Apr 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/0452

**Dalby, 70 Halsford Park Road, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 1PS, ,
Proposed two-storey side and rear extension. Introduction of render to partially replace hung tile cladding at the front elevation and a new enlarged porch
Ms Amy Loosley**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

One representation has been received in response to this application. In summary, an objection is raised for the following reasons relating to 72 Halsford Park Road:

- o Application does not appear to have fundamentally changed from the last application, which was refused; and
- o Like the previous scheme it would lead to a loss of aspect, severely affect light to a stairwell and cause risk due to the darker access.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Southern Water

Southern Water has determined that the flow rate for the above site will remain consistent, so capacity is not an issue, and no Southern Water assets will be affected. Therefore, Southern Water has no objections to this proposal.

TOWN COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No comment.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey side and rear extension, the introduction of render to partially replace hung tile cladding at the front elevation and a new enlarged porch.

RECENT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/25/2418 - Two-storey side and rear extension. Reconfiguration of front elevation with introduction of render to partially replace hung tile cladding. Refused.

72 Halsford Park Road

01/00921/FUL - Extension to residential property. Permission.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Dalby, 70 Halsford Park Road, is an east facing, two storey, detached dwelling. It is constructed of brick, with tile hanging at the first floor level, a plain tile roof and upvc windows. The dwelling is characterised by a front facing gable and pitched roof window that sits across the eaves line of the main house. It also benefits from an attached flat roof garage to the side and a single storey extension to the rear.

The site is located within the built up area of East Grinstead. Neighbouring dwellings are situated to the north, south and west of the site, whilst the highway is to the east. The dwelling is set back from the highway by a paved parking area and front garden.

APPLICATION DETAILS

This application follows a refused scheme for a two storey side and rear extension that included enlarging the first floor gable and the introduction of render to the front of the dwelling (DM/25/2418).

It is again proposed to undertake a two storey side extension, which would contain a garage at the ground floor. On the first floor this would allow for one bedroom to gain a walk in closet and an en-suite and another bedroom to gain a walk in closet. The garage is to be some 0.6 metres deeper than the existing structure and, as a result, the overall depth of this extension is to be some 10.1 metres. It is to be approximately 2.6 metres wide. Approximately the front 5.9 metres extension is to have a pitched roof that would continue the existing eaves and ridge lines of the host dwelling. The remaining 4.1 metres to the rear of this is to have a flat roof and an overall height of approximately 5.0 metres.

A two storey extension is also proposed to the rear of the house, which would adjoin the side extension. It is to contain a kitchen and dining area on the ground floor and two bedrooms on the first floor. Overall one new bedroom would be created, making a four bedroom house. The extension is to be some 4.3 metres deep and approximately 8.7 metres wide on the ground floor. The first floor is to be some 8.2 metres wide. Overall the rear section is to have a 'M' shaped roof that would continue the existing eaves and have reduced ridge height of approximately 6.7 metres. The remaining ground floor section is to have a mono-pitched roof that would measure some 2.6 metres to the eaves and 3.2 metres to the ridge.

It is also proposed to enlarge the existing open porch. The new porch is to be some 1.5 metres deep and 2.7 metres wide. A pitched roof design is proposed that would measure approximately 2.5 metres to the eaves and 3.6 metres to the ridge. The porch roof is to remain connected to the pitched roof over the bay window. A ground floor window within the front elevation is also to be reduced in size.

The majority of the elevations are to be finished in brick and tile hanging to match the house, other than the ground floor of the rear elevation that is to be finished in stone tiles. It is also proposed to render the first floor of the existing front gable projection.

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 policy:
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.

East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan

The East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan was formally made on 2nd November 2016.

Relevant policy:
Policy EG3 - Promoting Good 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 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:
DPS2 - Sustainable Design and Construction
DPB1 - Character and Design

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

Design and impact on the character of the area

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:

- 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 protects valued townscapes and the separate identity and character of towns and villages;*
- 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 (see Policy DP27);*
- o creates a pedestrian-friendly layout that is safe, well connected, legible and accessible;*
- o incorporates well integrated parking that does not dominate the street environment, particularly where high density housing is proposed;*
- o positively addresses sustainability considerations in the layout and the building design;*

o 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;
o optimises the potential of the site to accommodate development.'

East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan policy EG3 states:

'Planning permission will normally be granted where development proposals meet the following criteria:

- o The form of the proposed development is proportionate and in keeping with the scale, height, materials and site coverage of the surrounding area;*
- o The layout of the proposed development respects the topography and character of the site, protects important landscape features and does not harm adjoining amenity;*
- o The proposal does not result in the loss of buildings or spaces that would have an unacceptable impact on the character of the area;*
- o The proposal ensures satisfactory means of access for vehicles and pedestrians and provides adequate parking, cycle storage and refuse facilities on site;*
- o 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;*
- o New development must be inclusive and where appropriate make satisfactory provision for the safe and easy access for those with mobility impairment; and*
- o 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*
- o Proposals make provision for green infrastructure and biodiversity enhancement'.*

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.

Extensions should typically use simple, uncomplicated building forms to complement 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.

Extensions should not result in a significant loss to the private amenity area of the dwelling.

There are two general approaches to extending a property:

- o Designing in the style of the existing building by closely matching its facing materials, architectural features, window sizes and proportions; and*
- o Designing in a contemporary style that takes its cues from key aspects of the existing building that might include its underlying form and proportions, facing materials, window design and other specific architectural features. The success of this approach is particularly reliant on high quality facing materials and finishes, and this will normally need to be demonstrated through detailed elevations and section drawings.*

Both approaches can create successful, well-designed extensions that can be mutually beneficial to both the house and the wider area'.

In terms of side extensions, principle DG50 sets out they area

'are typically visible from the public realm and will be resisted where they have an adverse impact on the street scene or the appearance of a dwelling'.

It goes onto state:

'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'.

Principle DG51 relates to rear extensions and sets out:

'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 application relates to an established residential area of East Grinstead, where there is some variety in houses, however they all remain set back from the highway and are of a traditional design and form. This section of Halsford Road is also characterised by the spacing between houses and any built form to the boundary line is single storey, which allows this spacing still to be read.

This application follows the refused scheme DM/25/2418, which proposed similar works and was refused in part due to design concerns:

'The proposed two storey side extension would, by virtue of its design, form and scale, create an unsympathetic addition that would harmfully impact the proportions and character of the host dwelling, and would not appear subordinate to the existing building. The extension would be visible within the area, thereby creating an incongruous addition, and would enclose the space to the side of the dwelling that would be out of keeping with the spaciousness and the rhythm of streetscene. The use of white render on the extension would further add to its prominence. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policy EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan, Principles DG49 and DG50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework'.

Permission is again sought for a two storey side extension, although of a different design. The previous scheme sought to enlarge the existing front gable, where as the current proposal would extend out to the side of it. It is also to be, essentially, double the depth with the rear section finished with a flat roof.

Whilst the front gable is to remain unaltered, it is considered that the proposed side extension would still not appear subordinate to the host dwelling. It remains the case that the extension would not be set back from the front elevation, lying flush with the front wall, as well as the ridge line following that of the host dwelling. In terms of design, whilst the proposal would better reflect the vertical proportions of the house, the proposed hipped appears at odds with the main house and appears visually jarring. Under this application, the two storey side extension is to be deeper, with the rear section having a flat roof design. The inclusion of a flat roof, particularly on a two storey extension, is generally deemed unacceptable in design terms and remains the case in this instance as it appears at odds with the host dwelling. Furthermore it is considered that it highlights the additional bulk proposed and would not represent best design.

As before, the streetscene is characterised by the spacing of properties. The proposed side extension would again project to the site boundary and, whilst the design has changed, would still create the same overall roof form. The enclosing of space at the first floor level would be harmfully out of keeping with the more open character of the surrounding area. Furthermore, due to the spacing of houses along the road, there may be views to the proposed flat roof section. Given that this feature would not respond

appropriately to the host dwelling, it is considered that it would appear jarring and incongruous within the wider streetscene, particularly as it is characterised by pitched roof forms.

Issue was also raised under the previous application regarding the use of render on the front elevation. It was acknowledged that there are some examples of render in the streetscene but they are infrequent. No. 72, to the south, is rendered but this property is a bungalow. There is also render present on 74 Halsford Park Road and, whilst present on a first floor gable, is broken up by large areas of tile hanging around the bay windows. Given the overriding pattern of development it is considered that the use of render would again draw attention to the first floor of the property, particularly on the feature gable, and highlight the proposed side extension.

The proposed two storey rear extension would remain essentially the same width as the refused scheme and of a similar overall roof form. This would connect to the side extension. Previously the connection was ground floor only, which broke up the proposed massing. Under the current proposal it would now connect to the two storey addition, which appears more bulky and makes the rear extension less distinct. Overall the projections from the rear remain the same depth, with addition of further first floor accommodation. On balance, it is considered that the rear extension would remain acceptable and would not be significantly harmful in its own right that would warrant refusal.

Impact on amenity

Policy EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan states that proposals should "not harm" adjoining neighbours amenity whereas policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 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 DP26 is considered to take precedence and therefore the test in this instance is whether the development causes significant harm to neighbouring amenities as outlined above.

Concern has been raised regarding the impact to the 72 Halsford Park Road. The previous application was also refused regarding the impact on this neighbour. The reason stated:

'The height, depth and position of the proposed two storey rear extension would result in an unacceptable loss of outlook to 72 Halsford Park Road. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policy EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan, the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework'.

The BRE 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice', whilst not formally adopted by Mid Sussex District Council, is acknowledged as being a useful tool in assessing the impact development would have on the light to neighbouring properties. It should also be noted that the standard sets out that only habitable rooms should be taken into account, which would not include windows relating areas such as stairwells or bathrooms.

Again the proposed extensions would not protrude beyond the rear elevation of No. 72, therefore the rear windows of this neighbour would not be affected. As before, however, there are a number of windows along the side elevation of No. 72, facing the site, as well as a dormer window. Half of the windows in the dormer were observed as obscure glazed and, from the information available, it is understood that these windows are not associated with habitable spaces. It also remains the case that, due to the spacing of properties and the central position of the dormer, it is considered that there would still be a level of outlook available to these windows.

With regards to the ground floor windows, it was noted that the most eastern opening was obscure glazed and the western window appears to relate to the referenced kitchen. It is noted that there is a boundary fence, but it does not fully cover the kitchen window. The existing single storey projection also does not fully obscure the light and outlook available to this window. In the latest plans the part of the

extension closest to this neighbour has been staggered. The previous scheme proposed a two storey flank wall some 4.0 metres away from No. 72, whereas now a ground floor section is to be some 4.0 metres away and the two storey part set back 4.5 metres. Whilst it is noted that the two storey section has been set further away from the boundary, it would still fail the 25 degree test, as set out in the BRE good practice guide, and that the available light to this north facing window would be harmfully affected. Furthermore it is considered that the extension would be a more imposing feature, than the current single storey rear extension, which would also significantly harm the outlook available. It is considered that this harm would be compounded as it is understood that this is the only window associated with the kitchen.

With regards to the impact to 68 Halsford Park Road, this neighbour is to the north of the site and has been previously extended to the rear. It is noted that the two storey section would be brought closer to No. 68 than the previous application. Whilst it would be adjacent to the shared boundary, this neighbour is set back by approximately 2.0 metres. As it would project beyond their rear elevation by approximately 1.1 metres, it is considered that there would not be a significant loss of light or outlook to nearest rear windows.

There is one first floor side window in No. 68 that faces onto the proposed development and would be likely to be impacted by the proposed two storey side extension. This window was, however, observed on site to be obscure glazed. Given that this is likely to relate to non-habitable room it is considered that a significant loss of light or outlook would not occur from this extension.

No windows are proposed that would result in any direct overlooking. Given the domestic nature of the proposal there would not be a significantly harmful impact in terms of noise, air or light pollution.

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 proposed two storey side extension would, by virtue of its design, form, materials and scale, create an unsympathetic addition that would harmfully impact the character of the host dwelling, and would not appear subordinate to the existing building. The extension would be visible within the area, thereby creating an incongruous addition, and would enclose the space to the side of the dwelling that would be out of keeping with the spaciousness and the rhythm of streetscene. The two storey rear extension would also cause significant harm to the amenities of 72 Halsford Park Road, through a loss of light and outlook to a window which is understood to relate to a kitchen.

The proposal therefore would fail to comply with policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policy EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan, principles DG49, DG50 and DG51 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and the relevant provisions contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Decision: Refusal

Case Officer: Caroline Grist