

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/3026	Case Officer:	Tracie Axford
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed front porch and single storey side extension.		
Site:	2 Mulberry Cottage, Sandy Lane, Crawley Down, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 4HS, ,		
Validation Date	25 Nov 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	16 Feb 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	18 Feb 2026
Target Date:	20 Jan 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Tracie Axford

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Steven King	Date:	19 Feb 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/3026

**2 Mulberry Cottage, Sandy Lane, Crawley Down, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 4HS,
Proposed front porch and single storey side extension.**

Louise Kidd

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

None

WORTH PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Worth Parish Council defer decision to officer

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for a proposed front porch and a single storey side extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site comprises a modern two-storey semi-detached dwelling finished in brown brickwork with a grey slate tiled roof. The property features white uPVC fascia boards and window frames, black uPVC rainwater goods, and a green front door.

The dwelling is set back from Sandy Lane, with a lawned front garden and on-site parking. A private garden, primarily located to the side of the property, serves the dwelling. This garden, which accommodates the proposed extension, is enclosed by close-boarded timber fencing approximately 2.0 metres in height. The wider streetscene comprises dwellings of varying sizes and designs, constructed from a mix of external materials.

The site lies within a residential area and is designated in the Mid Sussex District Plan as being within the built-up area boundary of Crawley Down.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The application seeks planning permission for a a proposed front porch and a single storey side extension.

The front porch will measure 2.6 metres wide and will extend 1.5 metres from the front elevation. It will have a pitched roof with tiles to match the existing and will have a maximum height of 3.3 metres and will measure 2.2 metres to the eaves. Externally, it will have facing brickwork to match and fenestration to match the existing.

The property has already benefitted from a side extension which was permitted under reference DM/20/3467. This extension was set back to the rear of the property and measured approx. 3.9 metres. This application proposes to extend the extension towards the front elevation of the property by 3.5 metres so that it extends almost the full depth of the dwelling. The extension will have a maximum height of 3.8 metres with a pitched roof with solar panels. External materials will match the existing dwelling.

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 Crawley Down 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

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.

Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan

Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan made in 2016

Relevant Policy:

Policy CDNP04.1 Building extensions

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.

Relevant policies:

DPS1 - Climate Change

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)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is also a material consideration considered to be 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 properties
- Biodiversity Net Gain

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.'*

Policy CDPN04.1 of the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan deals with Building Extensions and states:

'Building extensions will be permitted provided they are in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan and meet the following criteria:

- a) The scale, height, and form of the extension should be subservient to the existing building, and should be in character with the street scene. Where appropriate, special regard should be had to sustaining and enhancing the setting and features of heritage assets and the Areas of Townscape Character.*
- b) The traditional boundary treatment of an area is retained and where feasible reinforced.*
- c) Suitable access and on- site parking is provided without detriment to neighbouring properties.*
- d) Amenities such as access, noise, privacy, daylight, sunlight and outlook of adjoining residents are safeguarded.*
- e) Gaps which provide views out of the village to surrounding countryside are maintained.*
- f) Materials are compatible with materials of existing/surrounding buildings.'*

Principle DG49 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide states: *'Extensions should typically use simple, uncomplicated building forms to compliment and coordinate with the scale, form and massing of the original dwelling. The design approach may benefit from coordinating with the existing pattern of window and door openings as well as employing facing materials to match those of the existing dwelling. Otherwise it should demonstrate the appropriateness of the alternative approach.'*

Principle DG50 relates to front and side extensions and states: *'Front extensions are more likely to be acceptable where the building line is staggered or where the dwelling is set well back from the road. They are less likely to be acceptable in streets with a strong consistent building form as they risk disrupting the underlying order. Where front extensions are considered acceptable, they should normally be limited to a modest single storey or porch-type extension that reflect the character of the existing property.'*

'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 proposed porch would project approximately 1.5 metres forward of the principal elevation but would maintain a set-back of around 3.1 metres from the highway. It would also be positioned approximately 1.1 metres from the neighbouring boundary. Owing to its limited projection and overall scale, the porch is considered modest in form. The proposed external materials would match those of the existing dwelling,

ensuring the addition reflects the character and appearance of the host property. Given the varied building line within the wider streetscene, the introduction of a porch in this location would not appear incongruous with the established pattern of development.

The proposed side extension projects forward of the earlier extension and would result in a built form extending up to the front elevation of the dwelling. Due to its single-storey height, it would remain visually subordinate to the original two-storey structure. The use of matching external materials would ensure the extension integrates appropriately with the existing dwelling, preserving its overall appearance.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policy CDNP04.1 of the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan, the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD and the NPPF.

Impact on neighbouring properties

In terms of impact upon neighbouring amenities Policy CDNP04.1 states that proposals should "safeguard" adjoining neighbours amenity whereas policy DP26 of the MSDP 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 of the MSDP 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.

It is not considered that the proposed development would give rise to any significant impacts to the neighbours due to their location in relation to the neighbouring properties. The front elevation of the adjoining property at No. 1 Mulberry Cottage is set back from No. 2 Mulberry Cottage, therefore the addition of the front porch at approximately 1 metre away from the boundary will not have any significant impact. The side extension will not extend any further than the existing side elevation and no neighbouring properties will be affected. There will therefore be no impact to neighbouring amenities in terms of privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight, and noise, air and light pollution.

Therefore, the proposal is considered to comply with the policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD in terms of impact on neighbouring amenity.

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

The proposal is appropriate in terms of design and will not negatively impact on the host dwelling nor its immediate setting and will not harm neighbouring amenities. Therefore, the proposal complies with policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policy CDNP04.1 of the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF and is considered acceptable.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Tracie Axford

