

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/24/3057	Case Officer:	Caroline Grist
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed ground and first floor rear extension, first floor front extension, front porch and part garage conversion into a habitable room.		
Site:	3 Highfield Drive, Hurstpierpoint, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9AT, , ,		
Validation Date	16 Dec 2024	Overall Expiry Date:	8 Jan 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	10 Feb 2025
Target Date:	10 Feb 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Caroline Grist</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Steven King</i>	Date:	10 Feb 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/24/3057

**3 Highfield Drive, Hurstpierpoint, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9AT, ,
Proposed ground and first floor rear extension, first floor front extension, front porch and part
garage conversion into a habitable room.
Hampton**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

No representations have been received in response to this application.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

No representations have been received from consultees.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Our recommendation is that MSDC should give permission.

INTRODUCTION

This application seeks planning permission for a ground and first floor rear extension, first floor front extension, front porch and part garage conversion into a habitable room.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/21/2459 - Two storey rear extension with first floor Juliette balconies, single storey rear extension, front porch and part garage conversion into a habitable room. Refused.

DM/22/3248 - Proposed front porch of less than 3m² external area, internal alterations and window alterations, existing flat roof dormer changed to pitch roof. Withdrawn.

DM/23/0492 - Two storey rear extension with first floor Juliette balcony, single storey rear extension, front porch and part garage conversion into a habitable room. Refused.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

3 Highfield Drive is a north facing, detached, chalet bungalow. The dwelling is constructed of red brick, with white render to the front, a pan tile roof and upvc windows. The dwelling is characterised by a front facing gable, which contains an integral garage, and a flat roof dormer window within the front roofslope. It also benefits from a single storey projection to the rear.

The application site is situated within the built up area of Hurstpierpoint. Neighbouring dwellings are situated south, east and west of the site, whilst the highway is to the north. The dwelling is set back from the highway by a driveway and front garden.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Planning permission is firstly sought for extensions to the rear of the house. A two storey addition is firstly proposed that would contain the kitchen on the ground floor and a new bedroom on the first floor. It is to be some 3.6 metres deep on the ground floor and 4.7 metres on the first floor, with a width of 5.0 metres.

Adjacent to the two storey rear extension, a ground floor extension is proposed that is to contain the living room. This addition is to be some 4.5 metres deep and 5.0 metres wide. It is to have a flat roof with an overall height of approximately 3.3 metres.

A pitch roof dormer window is lastly proposed to the rear, to enlarge an existing bedroom. It is to be some 3.6 metres wide, 1.4 metres to the eaves and 3.2 metres to the ridge.

An extension is also proposed to the front of the house, that would incorporate an existing porch and garage as well as a first floor addition. The porch and garage are to remain projecting in front of the front elevation. This is to be by some 1.2 metres. With regards to the first floor, this would project some 3.2 metres and have a width of 5.6 metres, enabling an existing bedroom to be enlarged. It is to have a pitched roof that would have an eaves height of approximately 3.8 metres and ridge height of 6.5 metres.

It is proposed to finish the extensions 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 Allocations 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

Site Allocations Development Plan Document

The Site Allocations 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.

Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan

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

There are no relevant policies.

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 the majority of 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

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 visual impact

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan relates to character and design, stating:

'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'.

For front extensions principle DG50 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.'

In terms of rear extensions principle DG51 states that where they

'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'.

Principle DG52 of the Design Guide states that if dormer windows or rooflights are out of scale or character with the roofscape and proportions of the dwelling they can have an adverse impact on both the dwelling and the streetscape. Where a clear rhythm of fenestration is established, the position and proportion of dormer windows should respond to this.

The application site is situated within an established residential area of Hurstpierpoint. Properties along this section of Highfield Drive are chalet bungalows and, whilst there is some variation in design, they are characterised by a low eaves height and many have dormer windows. The houses are also set back from the highway and are consistently spaced.

This submission follows two previously refused applications for a two storey rear extension, with first floor Juliette balconies, single storey rear extension, front porch and part garage conversion into a habitable room. Both of these applications (DM/21/2459 and DM/23/0492) were refused for the following reason:

'The proposed two storey rear extension, through its design, form and scale, would undermine the character of the chalet bungalow and result in the addition of a bulky and top heavy addition that would be significantly harmful to the appearance of the host dwelling. Due to the spacing of properties, the extension would also be visible within the streetscene and it would fail to relate sympathetically to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal therefore would not comply with Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Principles DG49 and DG51 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide and the National Planning Policy Framework'.

Since these applications were refused, a first floor extension to the front of 20 Highfield Drive has been permitted (DM/23/3128) and constructed.

The proposal currently under consideration has developed from the previously refused applications. The previous schemes showed various first floor extensions along the full rear elevation. This element has now been scaled back to a single first floor extension and a dormer window. Whilst not fully in keeping with the character of the chalet bungalow, the design is improved showing a more considered and consistent approach to the extensions. The dormer window is considered to be of an appropriate design and of a scale that would allow much of the roofslope to remain visible. Due to the layout of the street these works would be visible within the streetscene across No. 1, which is to the east of the application site. The two storey extension, however, is to be positioned to the western side of the dwelling and, as such, would appear less dominant in public views.

A similar extension is also proposed to the front of the dwelling. In accordance with the Design Guide, the property is set well back from the highway and such an addition would not disrupt the underlying order of the street. Whilst it would not be a ground floor addition, it is considered to be relatively modest in scale. The design would reflect the approach taken at No. 20. It is noted that No. 20 is of a different character to the application property, however the proposed scheme would respond appropriately to the design, proportions and materials of the host dwelling.

It is therefore considered that the current application would be appropriate in design terms and would not create an incongruous addition in the streetscene.

Impact to neighbour amenity

In terms of the impact to neighbouring amenity the test, policy DP2 6 of the Mid Sussex District Plan seeks to ensure that new 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 Policy DP27)*'.

In terms of the impact to amenity 1 Highfield Drive, to the east, is set further back in its plot. It has a garage closest to the shared boundary, with fencing between the two properties as well as some planting. Whilst there is a window within the flank elevation facing the site, it is partially screened by the fence and is understood not to be the only window associated with a habitable room. Given this arrangement it is considered that the proposal would not significantly affect the light or outlook to this neighbour.

5 Highfield Drive, to the west, appears to mirror that of the application property. It has a number of ground floor and first floor openings facing the application property, set within the main core of the house. There is a low boundary wall between the houses at this point and they both have single storey pitched roof, rear projections. It is therefore considered that the light and outlook available to these properties is already impacted by the current arrangement of the dwellings. These houses are shown to be set away from each other by approximately 1.0 metre. Given that the proposed first floor extensions will be set in and pitched away and the existing impact to these openings, it is considered that the proposed harm would not be significant enough to form a reason for refusing this application.

No windows are proposed that would result in any direct overlooking. Due to the domestic nature of the proposed development it is considered that it would not have a significant 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 proposal would accord with the requirements of policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan. The application is therefore considered acceptable.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Caroline Grist