

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/2025	Case Officer:	Caroline Grist
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey rear extension and a double storey side extension, including demolition of existing garage and side extension.		
Site:	97 Moat Road, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 3LW, , , ,		
Validation Date	10 Sep 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	19 Dec 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	6 Jan 2026
Target Date:	5 Nov 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Caroline Grist</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	7 Jan 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/2025

**97 Moat Road, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 3LW, , ,
Erection of a single storey rear extension and a double storey side extension, including
demolition of existing garage and side extension.
Roscoe And Rose Homes Ltd**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

No representations have been received in response to this application.

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

First Response

No comment.

Second Response

No comment.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey side and rear extension as well as the re-configuration of front elevation and introduction of render to partially replace hung tile cladding.

RECENT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/25/1133 - Erection of a single storey rear extension and a double storey side extension, including demolition of existing garage and side extension. Withdrawn.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

97 Moat Road is an east facing, two storey, semi-detached dwelling. It is constructed of brick, with render and at the first floor level, a plain tile roof and upvc windows. The dwelling is characterised by a front gable projection, containing a box window over the ground and first floors, with timber cladding in the eaves. The entrance is located in a cat slide feature to the side of the gable. To the side of the house was a garage, but this has now been demolished.

The site is located within the built up area of East Grinstead. Neighbouring dwellings are situated to the north and south, whilst the Kings Centre is to the west. The highway is located to the east. The dwelling is set back from the highway by a front garden.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The application seeks planning permission to construct a single storey rear extension and a two storey side extension. This would require the demolition of an existing garage and associated side extension.

Planning permission is firstly sought for a single storey rear extension that would create an enlarged living area. It is to be some 3.0 metres deep and would have a flat roof with an overall height of 2.8 metres. The addition is to project some 4.2 metres to the north of the dwelling, connecting into the side extension, and would contain a dining area. Continuing forwards would be the two storey side extension. This would span the depth of the house, except for a set back of approximately 0.5 metres. On the ground floor it would comprise a kitchen, bedroom and shower room. The first floor would contain a further bedroom and shower room and would also allow for the main bathroom to be enlarged. This extension would have a barn hip roof, continuing the existing eaves and having a reduced ridge height of approximately 7.5 metres. It would also include a pitched roof, dormer window within the proposed front roof slope. This would measure some 1.8 metres wide, 1.2 metres to the eaves and 1.9 metres to the ridge.

The extension is 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 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:

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.

There are no relevant policies.

East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan

The East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan was formally made on 2nd November 2016.

Relevant policies:

Policy EG3 - Promoting Good Design

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

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

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.'*

East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan policy EG3 states:

'Planning permission will normally be granted where development proposals meet the following criteria:

- o The form of the proposed development is proportionate and in keeping with the scale, height, materials and site coverage of the surrounding area;*
- o The layout of the proposed development respects the topography and character of the site, protects important landscape features and does not harm adjoining amenity;*
- o The proposal does not result in the loss of buildings or spaces that would have an unacceptable impact on the character of the area;*

- o *The proposal ensures satisfactory means of access for vehicles and pedestrians and provides adequate parking, cycle storage and refuse facilities on site;*
- o *The design of new buildings and the layout of spaces, including footways, car and cycle parking areas, should be permeable and provide connectivity with neighbouring areas;*
- o *New development must be inclusive and where appropriate make satisfactory provision for the safe and easy access for those with mobility impairment; and*
- o *The design of new developments must result in the creation of a safe and secure environment and incorporate adequate security measures and features to deter crime, fear of crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour; and*
- o *Proposals make provision for green infrastructure and biodiversity enhancement'.*

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'.

In terms of side extensions, principle DG50 sets out they

'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'.

Principle DG51 relates to rear extensions and sets out:

'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 relates to an established residential area of East Grinstead, where there is some variety in houses, however they all remain set back from the highway and are of a traditional design and form.

This application follows a scheme that was previously withdrawn, for the same form of development, due to design and amenity concerns (DM/25/1133). The application under consideration seeks to address these matters however, whilst the drawings initially provided were viewed as an improvement, issues with the design remained. This was due to the side extension appearing very squat, in relation to the host dwelling, and due to the inclusion of a large area of flat roof. Additionally this extension was not considered to reflect the proportions of the main house.

Revised plans were therefore provided and a re-consultation was issued. The changes to the side extension included reducing the width of the addition and providing a set back from the front elevation. The roof height was also increased, but remained lower than the host dwelling, and the flat roof section removed. The front dormer window was also reduced in width. Taking into account the overall revised design, it is considered that the proposed side extension would appear more proportionate in relation to the host dwelling. The removal of the flat roof element creates a more sympathetic addition and overall the extension would not appear as dominant. The dormer window would allow more of the roofslope to be retained and would appear as a more subordinate addition. With regards to the impact on the streetscene, whilst side extensions are generally single storey, there are some examples of those with first floor accommodation. It is considered that, with the changes that have been made, on balance the development would not result in a harmful addition to the streetscene.

In terms of the rear extension, it is considered that the proposed scale of the extension would be appropriate to the host dwelling. Whilst the flat roof is regrettable, the Design Guide does acknowledge that these additions can take a range of forms and this aspect of the proposal would not be readily visible in wider public views. With regards to the impact on the surrounding area, it is acknowledged that this addition, in combination with the side extension, would create a wrap around extension. This type of extension is not supported by the Design Guide however, due to the position of the dwelling within the street, the join of the two extensions would not be widely visible. As such the proposal would not read as a wrap around extension in the majority of views to it and, on balance, would not cause significant harm to the character of the area.

With regards to amenity, to the north of the site is 95 Moat Road, a detached bungalow. This neighbour has a ground floor side window and a dormer window facing onto the application site and a conservatory in close proximity to the shared boundary. A close boarded fence has been present along part of the shared boundary, alongside the conservatory, as have small sheds been alongside the side window, affecting the light and outlook available. The current proposal has the extensions set back from the shared boundary by some 1.7 metres and the side window would be closest to the single storey element. As such, whilst there may be some impact to the light available, given the described position it is considered that the harm would not be considered significantly harmful. With regards to No. 95's dormer window, the proposed two storey element would be sited to the east and would pitch away from the dormer in this direction. Furthermore a barn hip has been included in the side roof slope, which would further reduce the impact to the light and outlook available. As such, whilst some harm may occur, the level of harm would not be considered significant enough to warrant the refusal of this application.

In terms of the adjoining neighbour to the south, this neighbour has constructed a single storey rear extension, adjacent to the shared boundary. The submitted plans show that the proposed rear extension would not exceed the depth of this neighbour's addition, as such there would not be a harmful impact to their light or outlook.

No windows are proposed that would result in any direct overlooking and, given the domestic nature of the proposal, there would not be an adverse 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 and policy EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan and is therefore considered acceptable.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Caroline Grist