

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/0158	Case Officer:	Tracie Axford
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed replacement side extension		
Site:	Gabriels, 5A Saint Hill Green, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 4NG, , ,		
Validation Date	29 Jan 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	20 Feb 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	23 Mar 2026
Target Date:	26 Mar 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Tracie Axford</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Steven King</i>	Date:	23 Mar 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/0158

**Gabriels, 5A Saint Hill Green, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 4NG, ,
Proposed replacement side extension
Mr Juergen Epple**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Southern Water stated that the site is not within their statutory area.

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

East Grinstead Town Council made no comment on this application.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for a proposed replacement side extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

03/01030/FUL - Link between existing property and annex. Permitted 1991-06-28

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application property comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located on Saint Hill Green. Externally the property is constructed of stone brickwork with a slate roof. The property is set back from the highway and at a higher level than the road. The surrounding locality is characterised by semi-detached and detached properties of differing scale and design, many of which have been subject to various extensions and alterations over time.

The property is within the setting of several listed buildings, with 4 Saint Hill Green to the north of the application site and 6 Saint Hill Green to the south.

The site lies outside the built-up area of East Grinstead and is therefore in the countryside. The property is located within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Neighbouring properties are located to the south and west. Highway is located to the west.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposal seeks planning permission for a replacement side extension. External materials proposed will match the existing and use local stone for the front facing elevation with render to the side and rear elevation.

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 policies:

DP12 - Protection and Enhancement of Countryside

DP16 - High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
DP26 - Character and Design
DP34 - Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets

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 made in November 2016.

Relevant Policies:

Policy EG3 - Promoting Good Design

EG4 - Designated and Non Designated Heritage Assets.

Other Legislation

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 66(1) of the above Act states *'In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.'*

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:

DPS2 - Sustainable Design and Construction

DPS6 - Health and Wellbeing

DPB1 - Character and Design

DPB2 - Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets

DPC1 - Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside

DPC4 - High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

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.

ASSESSMENT

It is considered that the main issues that need to be considered in the determination of this application are as follows;

- Impact on the High Weald AONB
- Impact to the Setting of Listed Buildings
- Design and Character
- Impact on neighbouring properties

- Biodiversity Net Gain

Impact on the High Weald AONB

The legal framework for AONBs, (also known as National Landscapes) in England and Wales is provided by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (CRoW) 2000 which at Section 82 reaffirms the primary purpose of AONBs: to conserve and enhance natural beauty. Section 84 of the CRoW requires Local Planning Authorities to *'take all such action as appears to them expedient for accomplishment of the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB'*. The Levelling-up and Regeneration Act (2023) amended section 85 of the CRoW Act, to create a new duty on relevant authorities to *'seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area when discharging their functions in AONBs'*. A similar ethos is found within The High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan which is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications in the AONB.

Paragraph 189 of the NPPF states:

'Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and National Landscapes which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks.'

Policy DP12 in the District Plan seeks to protect the character of the countryside and states that development will be permitted where it maintains or where possible enhances the quality of the rural and landscape character of the District and is supported by a specific policy reference in the District Plan, Neighbourhood Plan or Development Plan Document. In this case policy DP26 is the relevant policy that supports high quality development.

The application relates to an existing building. Whilst it is sited outside of the built-up area of East Grinstead, it is situated within a small group of dwellings. As such the proposal would not form an isolated development within the wider landscape. Due to the development being a replacement extension of an existing building it is not considered to have an adverse impact on the overall landscape quality of the AONB. As such the proposal would comply with the requirements of Policies DP12 and DP16 of the District Plan, The High Weald AONB Management Plan and paragraph 189 of the NPPF.

Impact to the Setting of Listed Buildings

Policy DP34 of the District Plan in part states that:

'Development will be required to protect listed buildings and their settings. This will be achieved by ensuring that:

- A thorough understanding of the significance of the listed building and its setting has been demonstrated. This will be proportionate to the importance of the building and potential impact of the proposal;*
- Alterations or extensions to a listed building respect its historic form, scale, setting, significance and fabric. Proposals for the conversion or change of use of a listed building retain its significance and character whilst ensuring that the building remains in a viable use;*
- Traditional building materials and construction techniques are normally used. The installation of uPVC windows and doors will not be acceptable;*
- Satellite antennae, solar panels or other renewable energy installations are not sited in a prominent location, and where possible within the curtilage rather than on the building itself;*
- Special regard is given to protecting the setting of a listed building;*
- Where the historic fabric of a building may be affected by alterations or other proposals, the applicant is expected to fund the recording or exploratory opening up of historic fabric.*

Policy EG4 in the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan has similar aims.

Paragraphs 212 - 215 of the NPPF states:

'212. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.'

213. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification.

Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;*
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.*

214. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and*
- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation;*
and
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.*

215. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'

Due to the setback position of the dwelling from the highway, and the spacing of houses along Saints Hill Green, it is considered that given the modest nature of the proposal in relation to the host dwelling, and that the external material would be local stone to match the existing dwelling that there would not be an adverse impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings, which would be preserved by the proposal. It is therefore considered that proposal is considered to comply with policy DP34 of the District Plan, policy EG4 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF..

Design and Character

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states in part:

'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);'*

Policy EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan seeks to promote good design through the following measures(in part):

- 'a) The form of the proposed development is proportionate and in keeping with the scale, height, materials and site coverage of the surrounding area;*
- b) The layout of the proposed development respects the topography and character of the site, protects important landscape features and does not harm adjoining amenity;'*

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 states in part 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.'* In relation to side extensions, it states *'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 proposal will replace the existing annex and link currently located to the northern elevation of the host dwelling. The proposed side extension would result in a modest increase in footprint compared with the existing annex and link, and would have a greater overall height and a slightly further forward siting. Notwithstanding these changes, the extension would remain visually subservient to the host dwelling and would not detract from the established character or appearance of the original property.

As it is on the front elevation it will be visible from the public realm, however its design, scale, and materials are considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding street scene. Overall, the proposal is regarded as an improvement in design terms when compared with the existing annex.

Given the design, form and scale of the proposal in relation to the surrounding properties, and that it would be constructed in materials similar to those of the existing dwelling and the surrounding properties, the proposal complies with policy DP26 of the District Plan, policy EG3 of the East Grinstead 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 Policy DP29);'

Policy EG3 states that proposals should "not harm" 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.

The proposed extension is modest in scale extending just 1.4 m forward of the existing front elevation. The application dwelling is set back from the neighbouring property at no. 4 Saint Hill Green, therefore the proposal will not negatively impact this property in terms of light, privacy or outlook.

Given the domestic scale and nature of the proposed works, it is not anticipated that the development would give rise to any undue impacts in terms of noise, air quality, or light pollution. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to accord with Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, which seeks to protect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

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 policies DP12, DP16, DP26 and DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policies EG3 and EG4 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan, principles DG49 and 50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF and is considered acceptable.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Tracie Axford