

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/0276	Case Officer:	Catherine Cardin
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Single Storey Rear Extension.		
Site:	77 Church Lane, Copthorne, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 3QG, , ,		
Validation Date	3 Feb 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	27 Feb 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	24 Mar 2026
Target Date:	31 Mar 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Catherine Cardin</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/26/0276

**77 Church Lane, Copthorne, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 3QG, ,
Single Storey Rear Extension.
Matt And Fiona Kennard**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Southern Water

No objection.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Defer to Officer.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought for a single storey rear extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

WP/019/83- Porch, Garage and Single Storey Side Extension. Permission.
10/00904/FUL- Two storey extension to front and side. Permission.
DM/20/3033- Proposed loft conversion with 2No: rear dormers (revised plans received 22/10).
Permission.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

77 Church Lane is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling. The property is characterised by red brick, white upvc fenestration, a pantile roof and pebble dash render to the first-floor elevation. The property benefits from a two-storey extension to the front and side and an area of off-street parking to the front of the property to accommodate approximately one car.

The property is located within the built-up area boundary of Copthorne. Neighbouring properties are located to the east, west and north. Highway is located to the south.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposed rear extension would measure some 9.3 metres in width and some 4 metres in depth. This would have a pitched roof with a maximum height of some 3.5 metres and a height to the eaves of some 2.4 metres. It is proposed to install sliding doors, a door and a window on the rear (northern) elevation. It is also proposed to install 3 no. rooflights to the rear roof pitch. This would be finished in external materials to match the existing. It is proposed to use the extension as a lounge/diner and kitchen.

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 Copthorne 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 DPD

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

No relevant policies

Neighbourhood Plan

Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan was made in September 2021.

Relevant policies:

COP04.1 - Building Extensions

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:

DPB1 - Character and Design

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

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

- Design and Character
- Neighbouring Amenities

- Parking arrangements
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Design and Character

Policy DP26 of the District Plan relates to character and design and requires all proposals to be well designed and reflect the distinctive character of the towns and villages while being sensitive to the countryside as well as addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape. In part the policy requires proposals to be of a high-quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace; and creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape.

Policy CNP1 of the Neighbourhood Plan states (in part):

'CNP1.1 Proposals will be supported where they sustain or reinforce the positive aspects that make up the individual character and distinctiveness of each Character Area, as defined on the Policies Map, in which they sit.

CNP1.6 Extensions to existing buildings will be supported provided they adhere to other policies in the development plan and:

- a) Are no higher than the existing building.*
- b) Do not conflict with traditional boundary treatment of an area.*
- c) Use materials which are compatible with materials of existing/surrounding buildings.'*

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.'

Principle DG51 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide relates to rear extensions and 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 application site lies within the built-up area boundary of Copthorne. The proposed extension would be of a form and design which is acceptable and is considered to be in proportion and appropriate to the character of the existing dwelling. It is considered that the proposal appropriately considers the side boundaries and adjacent buildings and gardens. The proposal would be finished in external materials to match the existing which would provide a consistent finish. The proposed rear extension would not be visible from the street scene and, as such, it is not considered that there would be harm to the character of the area.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy DP26 of the District Plan, policy CNP1 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant principles of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenities

In terms of impact on neighbouring amenities, Policy DP26 of the District Plan states proposals 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'.*

Policy CNP1.2 of the Neighbourhood Plan requires that *'proposals for new development should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity (including general activity, access, noise, privacy, daylight, and sunlight) of existing and future occupants, both on site and nearby.'*

As such there is some conflict between the two policies.

Under section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 if a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflict 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 CNP1.2 of the Neighbourhood Plan is considered to take precedence and therefore the test in this instance is whether the development causes unacceptable harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents.

No 79. Church Lane lies to the northeast of the application site. The neighbouring dwelling is set back from the shared boundary by approximately 3.8 metres, and a detached garage sits between the proposal and no. 79. While the proposed extension would be constructed up to the boundary, the existing arrangement helps to limit the extent of any impact. The development would result in some reduction in light and outlook to no. 79; however, given the single-storey nature of the extension, its pitched roof form, and the separation created by the garage, the level of impact is not considered to result in unacceptable harm to the residential amenity. In addition, as no windows are proposed in the side elevation, the scheme would not lead to any unacceptable overlooking concerns.

75 Church Lane lies to the southwest of the application site. The neighbouring property benefits from a single-storey rear extension, which projects a shorter distance than the extension proposed under this application. The proposed development would be constructed up to the shared boundary, and while it would result in some loss of light and outlook to no. 75, the light impact is not considered to amount to unacceptable harm. This is due to the single-storey nature of the scale of the proposal and its pitched roof form, which help limit the overall sense of enclosure. In addition, no windows are proposed in the side elevation, the scheme would not give rise to unacceptable overlooking concerns.

Due to the domestic nature of the proposed development, it is considered that there would not be a harmful impact in terms of noise, air and light pollution.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore deemed to accord with the above-mentioned part of policy CNP1.2 of the Neighbourhood 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

The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of design, size and scale to the dwellinghouse and locality, and would not cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties.

In conclusion, the proposal would accord with the requirements of policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and policy CNP1 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan. It is therefore considered acceptable.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Catherine Cardin