

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/3242	Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Alteration, extension and re-modeling of existing dwelling house including a new roof structure with new first floor and a single storey rear corner infill extension		
Site:	Skyline, 90 Valebridge Road, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 0RP, , ,		
Validation Date	2 Feb 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	26 Feb 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	24 Mar 2026
Target Date:	30 Mar 2026	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:	24 Mar 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/3242

**Skyline, 90 Valebridge Road, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 0RP, ,
Alteration, extension and re-modeling of existing dwelling house including a new roof structure
with new first floor and a single storey rear corner infill extension
Mr Andrews**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

There were no letters of representation received in response to the proposed development.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Lewes District Council: No comment.

Tree Officer: No objection.

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Town Council: *'Council would like to object to this planning application on the grounds of it being overdevelopment'*

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for the development of a first floor, a single storey front, side and a rear extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

There is no recent history of planning applications relating to the site.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The proposal relates to Skyline, a detached bungalow which features a flat parapet roof type. The dwelling is set to the eastern side of the highway with access served through a tarmacked driveway. Existing mature front boundary planting partially screens the property from the public view along the highway and the dwelling is set back from the highway edge by front garden amenity space. Further rear garden amenity space is set to the rear of the dwelling with some mature tree planting set within. The dwelling appears to have been extended previously to the rear through the addition of a single storey conservatory. The existing dwelling is composed of facing brickwork walls, a single play flat roof membrane, uPVC windows and uPVC doors.

With regard to the site's locality, there are a number of other detached residential dwellings set to either side of the road. Some properties to the eastern side appear to have been extended and modernised over time, with several dwellings utilising a chalet bungalow appearance.

The site is located outside of the built-up area for Burgess Hill, with the southern boundary distinguishing the built-up area moving southwards. The rear of the site is intersected by the District Boundary with Lewes District.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposal would develop a first-floor extension above the existing single storey flat roof. The proposed first floor extension would measure at circa 13.7m wide, 11.7m wide, 3.5m high to the highest point of the eaves and 7.8m high to the ridge.

A new single storey side and rear extension would be developed as part of the proposal which would measure at circa 7.2m in length, 5.7m wide and 3.3m high.

To the rear elevation a first-floor balcony/ canopy would be developed which would measure at approximately 19m in length, 1.2m wide and 3.3m high.

The proposal would also develop a new front porch which would measure at circa 5.1m in length, 2.5m wide, 3.9m in maximum eaves height and 5.1m high to the ridge.

Proposed external materials would comprise vertical weatherboard cladding and render to the exterior walls, oak column support for the front porch, slate roof tiles, uPVC and grey powder coated metal frame windows, composite timber doors and grey velux rooflights.

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 and Site Allocation Development Plan Document (DPD).

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

DP37: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows

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.

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

DPN4 - Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows

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, 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
- Trees Impact
- 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 existing dwelling is considered to be of a unique appearance within the street scene and features a large expanse of flat roof. There are several chimneys protruding from the flat roof as well as a doorway to access the roof space. It is considered that the existing flat roof coupled with the brick exterior walls leads to a bulky appearance which is of limited architectural merit.

The proposed extensions are considered to give rise to a more contemporary overall appearance through the use of the double gable design as well as the vertical weatherboard and render to the walls. Whilst this would make the dwelling one of the more modern properties within the street scene, it is considered that other nearby dwelling such as Green Hedges to the south of the application site utilise a more contemporary appearance through the use of exterior render and dark coloured roof tiles. Accordingly, the proposal would not be an outlier amongst the wider street scene although chalet bungalows tend to be the predominant character to the eastern side of the street.

Although the proposed first floor extension would increase the overall perceived size, scale and bulk of the property, it is considered that the use of the shallow roof pitches would help minimise its overall bulk and massing. Furthermore, the use of the single storey garage element and the double gable design are considered to help break up the overall bulk of the proposal.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy DP26 of the District 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);'*

There are no side (north) elevation windows that would face back out towards the proposed development. To the rear, the lowest nearest window to the proposed development at the neighbouring dwelling to the south at No.88 serves as a primary window to a bedroom.

In terms of light impact to this neighbouring rear 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 "45 degree approach" should be taken whereby a 45 degree line is drawn from the top of the elevation and a second 45 degree line is taken from the end of the projection. If the neighbouring properties window lies within the centre of both lines, then the building will 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 assessed as an estimate against the 45 degree test in both plan and elevation format, the proposed extensions would pass. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not give rise to a significant loss of light impact towards the adjacent neighbouring dwelling to the south. Furthermore, the proposed first floor extension would be offset circa 6m from the shared boundary and is not considered to result in a significant overbearing impact.

To the north at the neighbouring bungalow at No.92, there is an existing secondary window serving a lounge to the principal (west) elevation. This would likely pass the 45 degree test both in plan and elevational format when assessed as an estimate.

Furthermore, there is a side (south) elevation window which serves as a primary window to a dining room. The 25 degree test should therefore be applied as this window would be positioned opposite to the proposed extension. The proposed extension would pass the 25 degree test when taken from this

nearby kitchen window. Furthermore, the proposed first floor extension would be set circa 12m away at its closest point. Therefore, it is not considered that a significant overbearing impact would be incurred.

A new balcony would be included to the rear of the property which has the potential to offer views out towards the other neighbouring properties. However, the submitted plans show that this would include 1.8m high privacy screen to both the north and south. This is considered to help preserve neighbouring privacy and views from the balcony would primarily be restricted towards the application sites garden amenity space out to the east. A condition ensuring that these privacy screens remain intact is considered relevant and necessary to protect neighbouring amenity, should planning permission be granted.

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

Trees Impact

In relation to new developments impact on trees, policy DP37 of the District Plan states that:
'The District Council will support the protection and enhancement of trees, woodland and hedgerows, and encourage new planting. In particular, ancient woodland and aged or veteran trees will be protected.'

Development that will damage or lead to the loss of trees, woodland or hedgerows that contribute, either individually or as part of a group, to the visual amenity value or character of an area, and/ or that have landscape, historic or wildlife importance, will not normally be permitted.

Proposals for new trees, woodland and hedgerows should be of suitable species, usually native, and where required for visual, noise or light screening purposes, trees, woodland and hedgerows should be of a size and species that will achieve this purpose'

An Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Method Statement and Tree Protection plan was submitted in support of the application due to the extensions proximity to existing trees on site. No objection was raised towards the proposal from the Council's Trees Officer.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered to comply with the provisions of policy DP37 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, will not negatively impact on the host dwelling nor its immediate setting, will not harm neighbouring amenities and result in an acceptable impact on nearby trees.

The proposal will comply with Policies DP26 and DP37 of the District Plan, the MSDC Design Guide and the requirements of the NPPF.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Stefan Galyas