

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/1039	Case Officer:	Caroline Grist
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Single storey side extension.		
Site:	1 Oakwood Close, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 0HY, , , ,		
Validation Date	25 Apr 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	3 Jun 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	16 Jun 2025
Target Date:	20 Jun 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Caroline Grist</i>

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	2
--	--	-------------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	17 Jun 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/1039

**1 Oakwood Close, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 0HY, , ,
Single storey side extension.
Mrs Jayne Millard**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

Two representations have been received in response to this application, one raising objection and the other in support.

In summary, the issues raised are as follows:

- o Would alter the look of the street as it would bring the building footprint closer to the edge of Oakwood Road;
- o View has been spoilt by the previous removal of trees at this property;
- o The loss of trees has affected bird life;
- o Further building works would change the view of Rosary Court;
- o Contractors vehicles would cause an obstruction by parking outside of Rosary Court; and
- o Previous issue when works took place at the application site.

The points raised in the support of the application:

- o Proposed extension would be in keeping with other properties;
- o Other houses in Oakwood Close have been extended;
- o Position of the extension is such that it would not reduce light to neighbours;
- o The trees removed were scruffy and hedging has been planted;
- o The traffic in Oakwood Close is light; and
- o Proposed extension would not obscure vision onto Oakwood Road.

In summary the following points have been made by the applicant:

- o Rosary Court is set back from the road and have trees across the boundary with the highway, obstructing their view;
- o The height of the hedge at 1 Oakwood Close would obscure the view of the extension from Rosary Court;
- o Oakwood Road has no parking restrictions and can be used by members of the public;
- o Response to previous works undertaken at 1 Oakwood Close;
- o Applicant seeks to be considerate to neighbours;
- o Removed trees were conifers that were oversized and too close to the house;
- o Following the removal of the trees planting has been undertaken to increase wildlife diversity; and
- o Letters of support were submitted for the previously considered two storey extension, as part of the appeal.

It should be noted that only material planning conditions can be taken into account when determining a planning application. The loss of a view is not a material consideration neither are works that have been previously undertaken that are not associated with this application. The granting of any planning application does not override other relevant legislation, such as those in relation to parking on the highway.

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

Recommend approval.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought for a single storey side extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/21/2929 - Single storey front and side extension with roof lights, and internal alterations with 2 extra bathrooms on first floor. Permission.

DM/24/2254 - Proposed two storey side extension. Refused. Dismissed at appeal.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1 Oakwood Close is an east facing, detached, two storey dwelling that is located on a corner plot. The dwelling is finished in white render, with a plain tile roof and white upvc windows. It is characterised by two catslide roofs that project from either side of the two storey core of the dwelling. Within the northern offshoot of the building there is an integral garage.

The property is located within the built up area of Burgess Hill. Neighbouring dwellings are located to the north and west. Oakwood Close is to the east and Oakwood Road is to the south. The dwelling is set back from the highway by a driveway.

APPLICATION DETAILS

This application seeks planning permission for a single storey side extension that would contain a snug and utility area. It is to be some 3.5 metres wide and 6.8 metres deep. A pitched roof design is proposed that would measure approximately 2.3 metres to the eaves and 3.8 metres to the ridge.

The application form states that the elevations and roof are to be finished in materials to match the host 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 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:

DP26 - Character and Design

Site Allocation Development Plan Document

The Site Allocation DPD was adopted on 29th June 2022. It allocates sufficient housing and employment land to meet identified needs to 2031.

There are no relevant policies.

Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan

The Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan was made in January 2016.

There are no relevant policies.

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 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:

DPS2 - Sustainable Design and Construction

DPS6 - Health and Wellbeing

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 2023)

ASSESSMENT

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.'

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'.

Principle DG50 relates specifically to side extensions and states that:

'Front and side extensions 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.

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'.

The application site is located within an established residential area of Burgess Hill. Surrounding dwellings within Oakwood Close are of a similar age and design, however there have been a number of visible extensions and alterations to these properties. They all remain, however, set back from the road, with the majority containing predominant two storey sections that have a splayed roof. There is also consistency within the use of materials.

Planning permission has been granted at this dwelling for a single storey side extension as well as a front extension, which would increase the depth of the garage (DM/21/2929). The Officer's report set out the following assessment:

'The application property is set well back from the road. Both extensions are to be set back from the central two storey section, allowing this to remain the dominant element. Whilst the side extension is deep, it is considered that the proposed additions would not overwhelm the application property and the single storey nature of the works would further assist in the extensions appearing subordinate. The proposed extensions are of a design that would be in keeping with the character of the application property, including the continuation of the splayed roof design, and the use of materials to match would provide a consistent finish. The proposed side extension would not infill all of the space to the side of the property, allowing the spacing of the street to be maintained'.

Following this, an application was considered for a two storey side extension (DM/24/2254) that was refused for the following reason:

'The proposed extension would, by virtue of its design, form and scale, create an unsympathetic addition that would not appear subordinate to the existing building and would undermine its character. The extension would be highly visible from public vantage points, thereby resulting in a dominant and incongruous addition to the streetscene that would also wholly enclose an important gap at the entrance to Oakwood Close, which would be out of keeping with the spaciousness and the rhythm of neighbouring buildings. The proposal therefore would fail to comply with Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Principles DG49 and DG50 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and the relevant provisions contained within the National Planning Policy Framework'.

This decision was taken to appeal and was dismissed, with the Inspector agreeing with the reason for refusal.

The application currently under consideration relates to a single storey side extension. Whilst the proposed scheme includes a reduced set back from the front elevation, when compared to DM/21/2929, it is a true single storey addition. Additionally the front and rear extensions included under DM/21/2929 have now been omitted and, overall, it is considered that the proposed addition would appear subordinate in scale. The design would again be in keeping with the application property, including a roof design that reflects the host dwelling and materials to match. Whilst some 0.1 metres wider than the previously approved addition, the proposed extension would still not infill all of the space to the side of the property, which would still allow the spacing of the street to be maintained. Surrounding properties have benefitted from extensions and alterations and, given the appropriateness of the scale and design in relation to the main house, it is considered that the proposal would not appear incongruous within the streetscene.

In terms of the impact on surrounding properties, it is noted that the extensions would be within close proximity to Greystoke, to the west of the site. This neighbour is situated on higher land and is set further back within its plot. Given the scale and position of the proposed extensions in relation to this neighbour it is considered that there would not be a harmful impact to this neighbour's amenity.

With regards to the impact to Rosary Count, from the submitted location plan, this neighbour would be between some 28.0 and 30.0 metres away from the proposed extension. Due to this distance it is considered that the proposed extension would not have a harmful impact on the light and outlook available to this property.

No windows are proposed that would result in any direct overlooking and, due to the domestic nature of the proposed works, it is considered that there would not be an adverse impact in terms of noise, air or light pollution.

It is noted that there are records of a tree within the front garden of 1 Oakwood Close, protected by a Tree Preservation Order. It has been previously demonstrated that this tree has been historically removed. Due to this, and the position of the proposed development in relation to other surrounding trees, it is considered that the proposal would not have a harmful impact to trees in the surrounding area.

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 would accord with the requirements of policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and is therefore considered acceptable.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Caroline Grist