

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/1649	Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and fenestration alterations.		
Site:	74 Oak Hall Park, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 0DB, , , ,		
Validation Date	26 Jun 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	22 Jul 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	18 Aug 2025
Target Date:	21 Aug 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Stefan Galyas</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Steven King</i>	Date:	18 Aug 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/1649

**74 Oak Hall Park, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 0DB, , ,
Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and fenestration alterations.
Duncan Holden**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

There were no letters of representation received in response to the current proposal.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Southern Water: No objection.

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Town Council: *'The Committee of the 14th July would recommend approval.'*

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for the development of a two storey side extension, the demolition of a rear conservatory, a single storey rear extension and alterations to the existing dwellings fenestration.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

BH/085/81 - Two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and fenestration alterations.
Permission 27.04.1981.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application relates to 74 Oak Hall Park, a two storey detached chalet style dwelling set to the western side of the highway. The existing dwelling is set back from the roadside edge by a front grassed garden and is served access through a tarmacked front driveway. The dwelling is afforded further garden amenity space to the rear where a shed outbuilding is positioned. There is an existing single storey adjoining flat roofed element to the south which currently houses an integral garage. In terms of existing materials, the dwelling is composed of brick and stone walls with tile hanging featured at first floor level, clay roof tiles, white uPVC windows and doors.

With regard to the sites locality, there is a mix of both bungalows and two storey dwelling throughout the street scene. Visual interest is added within the locality through tile hanging at first floor level and variance in the gable ends facing the roadside.

The site is within the built-up area for Burgess Hill as defined in the District Plan (DP). There are trees to the rear of the site subject to Tree Preservation Orders.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposal would develop a side (south) elevation two storey extension which would measure at approximately 10.3m in maximum length, 2.7m wide, have an eaves height of 2.7m and a maximum height measuring at 5.6m high.

To the rear (west) elevation, the existing conservatory would be demolished and a single storey extension would be developed. The proposed extension would measure at approximately 1.6m in length, 9.4m wide and 2.7m high.

The windows to the principal (east) elevation would also be altered at ground floor level to be of a greater size. Proposed external materials throughout would include red brick exterior walls, clay roof tiles and dark grey uPVC windows and doors.

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 Burgess Hill 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:

DP21: Transport

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.

Neighbourhood Plan

Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan (Made January 2016)

Relevant Policies:

Policy S4 - Parking Standards for New Developments.

Other Material Considerations

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 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

DPT4 - Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure

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, 11, 39, 48, 115-117, 131, 135 & 139.

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 Amenities
- Impact on Highways and Parking
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Design and Character

Policy 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'*

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 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide elaborates further on what constitutes 'good design' in relation to side extensions:

'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 terms of rear extensions, principle DG51 states:

'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 proposed single storey wrap around extension would intersect the existing front porch and would utilise a hipped roof form. It is considered that the side extension would appear subservient towards the existing dwelling, owing to its limited size and scale. It is considered that the use of matching external materials would help the proposal further assimilate with the existing. As such, this element of the proposal is considered to result in an acceptable impact.

It is considered that there is a degree of visual variance throughout the existing street scene with properties of varying sizes and designs, featuring both bungalows and two storey chalet style dwellings. There are also a number of properties to the rear of the site (west) along Pinehurst which feature a comparable design to the application dwelling.

The proposed two storey side extension is considered to contribute further towards the dwellings overall perceived bulk and scale. The extension would have a circa 1.8m offset from the existing ridge height which is considered to help the extension be read as a later addition to the dwelling and improve its overall subservience. The use of matching materials are also considered to help the proposal assimilate well with the existing.

A lean to roof pitch would be used to the principal elevation which is considered to appear acceptable in connection with the existing dwellings pitched roof design. The proposed lean to roof would then rise up towards a two storey flat roof. Whilst the flat roof is not considered to be of an optimal design, it is considered that similar design approaches have been used nearby such as at the neighbouring site to the west at 11 Pinehurst. Moreover, it is not considered that the proposed flat roof would be significantly visible from the roadside and views would largely be obscured by the proposed lean to roof pitch.

To the rear (west) elevation, the existing single storey conservatory would be demolished and a single storey full width extension would be developed partly in its place. This extension is considered to be of a limited overall footprint and clearly appear subservient towards the main dwelling.

The existing front bay window serving the lounge would be removed and a new larger window would be added in its place. The use of dark grey uPVC windows throughout would likely give rise to a more contemporary overall appearance, however these alterations are not considered to be unacceptable provided the estate context of the site.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy DP26 of the District Plan, Policy H2 of the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant principles of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenities

In terms of impact upon neighbouring amenities, Policy DP26 in part seeks to ensure 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 DP29);'*

The proposed two storey side extension would be positioned within a close proximity to the shared boundary with No.76 immediately to the south of the site. It is noted that this neighbouring bungalow has one unobscured glazed kitchen window and two obscure glazed bathroom windows which would face back towards the proposed extension.

In terms of light impact to these 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 opposite 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.

When the neighbouring side (north) elevation windows are assessed against the 25 degree test, it is considered that the 25 degree angle would likely be breached. The angle would just fail, however following a site visit it was confirmed that these neighbouring windows serve non-habitable rooms with two of the windows remaining in an obscure glazed finish. In any instance, these neighbouring windows are considered to already receive a reduced level of light by virtue of their north facing orientation. It is therefore not considered that the proposed extension would give rise to a significant overbearing or overshadowing impact.

The proposed flat roof to the rear extension has the potential to be used as an outdoor balcony space. However, plans show that there would be a drop of circa 0.8m between the first-floor windows and the roof. It is also considered that the resultant flat roof space would not be of a significant area. Upon further assessment, it is not considered necessary to condition the roof against being used as an outdoor balcony space.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered to comply with the provisions of DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan in terms of neighbouring amenities.

Impact on 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.

Policy S4 of the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan in part states:

'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. Design and layout of off-site parking areas, on street parking areas, garage/parking blocks will be designed to allow ease of access from driveways and accessibility to parking areas without causing obstruction.'

Appendix D of the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan sets out that 3 bedroom dwellings located outside the defined Town Centre area are required to provide 2 designated spaces and 1 non-designated space per 2 dwellings. West Sussex County Council September 2020 Parking Standards Guidance, outlines that for a 3-bedroom dwelling in this location, 2 allocated parking spaces should be provided.

It is considered that the existing front driveway which is served by a dropped kerb would accommodate sufficient space for one off road parking place. It is however considered that Oak Hall Park is not subject to on street parking restrictions nearby the application dwelling and the shortfall is not considered to be significant enough to warrant a reason for refusal on this basis. As such, the proposal is considered to meet the provisions of DP21 of the District Plan.

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 proposal is appropriate in terms of design and will not negatively impact on the host dwelling nor its immediate setting, will not harm neighbouring amenities and result in an acceptable highways impact.

The proposal will comply with Policies DP21 and DP26 of the District Plan, Policies S4 and H2 of the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan, the MSDC Design Guide and the requirements of the NPPF.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Stefan Galyas