

PLANNING STATEMENT

Householder application for domestic extensions, roof enlargement, patio steps, new driveway and new vehicular access

10 Furzeland Way, Sayers Common, BN6 9JB

Prepared in support of a householder planning application

Site address	10 Furzeland Way, Sayers Common, BN6 9JB
Client	Matt Staplehurst
Local Planning Authority	Mid Sussex District Council
Prepared by	Ellisdon Architectural Associates
Date	June 2026
Application type	Householder planning application
Related matter	Pending proposed Lawful Development Certificate application for a materially similar domestic enlargement fallback

Contents

1. Executive summary
2. Site context and existing access arrangement
3. The application proposal
4. Submitted drawings and factual basis
5. The pending LDC fallback and why it matters
6. Planning policy framework
7. Design, scale and appearance
8. Residential amenity
9. New driveway and vehicular access from the B2118
10. Front garden driveway, drainage and landscaping
11. Patio steps
12. Response to likely concerns
13. Suggested planning conditions
14. Planning balance and conclusion
15. Source and policy references

1. Executive summary

This Planning Statement is submitted in support of a householder planning application at 10 Furzeland Way, Sayers Common, BN6 9JB. The application seeks permission for a comprehensive package of domestic improvement works to an existing single-storey bungalow, including single-storey additions, a hip-to-gable roof enlargement, a rear dormer, front rooflights, patio steps, a new front driveway and a new vehicular access from the B2118.

The central planning issue is not whether the application should be treated as a new dwelling, a materially different residential use, or a scheme that would generate additional traffic. It should not. The proposal remains a single dwellinghouse in domestic use. It is a householder improvement scheme designed to make an existing bungalow work properly as a family home.

The application must also be assessed against the very important site-specific context: a proposed Lawful Development Certificate application is already pending for a materially similar domestic enlargement fallback. That LDC scheme has been specifically designed to address the applicant's understanding of the technical permitted-development issue arising where a proposed rear dormer would meet a post-1948 rear extension. The LDC drawing therefore shows a technical roof solution in which the existing rear-extension roof is altered/lowered so that the dormer does not physically merge with that rear-extension roof.

The householder application seeks permission for the better planning solution. Instead of forcing the existing rear-extension roof to be artificially lowered to satisfy a technical GPDO route, the householder scheme retains the existing rear-extension roof form and allows the proposed rear dormer to meet it in a coherent manner. This preserves adequate internal ceiling heights, avoids a contrived roof junction, reduces unnecessary reconstruction, and maintains the existing style of the single-storey rear roof which is already present on site.

The LDC fallback is not speculative. It has been formally submitted and remains pending. The revised LDC drawing includes roof-volume calculations showing a hip-to-gable volume of 10.56 cubic metres and a rear dormer volume of 31.242 cubic metres, producing a total roof enlargement of 41.802 cubic metres. That is below the usual 50 cubic metre Class B roof-volume allowance for a detached or semi-detached dwellinghouse. The application scheme should therefore be assessed by comparing its planning effects not only against the existing bungalow, but also against the realistic fallback scheme that the applicant is actively pursuing.

In design terms, it is acknowledged that Mid Sussex guidance generally seeks smaller and visually subordinate dormers. However, that guidance is not an absolute prohibition, and it must be applied with planning judgement. In this case, the principal public-facing roof slope is treated with rooflights rather than a front dormer; the main dormer is to the rear; the roof enlargement does not create a new dwelling; the overall domestic character remains; and the fallback demonstrates that a materially similar roof enlargement is realistically available.

The access proposal is also strongly justified. The existing vehicle access via Furzeland Way is narrow, contrived and unsatisfactory. It approaches the rear garden rather than the front of the dwelling, provides no sensible turning arrangement and is not suitable for normal family-car use. The proposed new B2118 access and front driveway create a logical, direct and purpose-designed access arrangement for the dwelling. The submitted block plan shows 2.4m x 43m visibility splays in both directions, consistent with the usual visibility expectation for a 30mph environment.

The proposal therefore delivers a better overall planning outcome than the technical LDC fallback and a significantly better access arrangement than the existing constrained rear approach. Planning permission should be granted.

2. Site context and existing access arrangement

The application site contains an existing single-storey bungalow at 10 Furzeland Way, Sayers Common. The submitted existing plans show the bungalow with existing ground-floor accommodation and an established single-storey rear addition. The existing rear addition forms part of the dwelling as presently found on site and is central to the internal and external layout of the property.

The property has a frontage relationship with the B2118, but the current practical vehicle access is via Furzeland Way and a narrow rear track. That arrangement is unusual and unsatisfactory for a family home. It does not bring vehicles to the principal entrance or frontage. Instead, it approaches the rear garden by way of a constrained route.

The applicant's position is that the track is so narrow and contrived that it does not allow a large family car to pass down in any normal or comfortable manner and does not allow a proper on-site turning arrangement.

The planning context is therefore materially different from a proposal seeking a second or additional access merely as a matter of convenience. The application seeks to replace a poor and functionally illogical rear-access arrangement with a direct, legible and purpose-designed front access from the B2118. That is a planning benefit, not simply a private preference.

The existing single-storey rear extension is also important. It has a roof form which, on the applicant's understanding, does not neatly comply with the relevant GPDO eaves-height limitation if assessed against the original bungalow roof. The pending LDC has therefore adopted a conservative technical solution by lowering or adapting that roof so that it does not meet the rear dormer. The householder application avoids that contrived outcome and instead retains the existing rear-extension roof style.

3. The application proposal

The householder application comprises the following elements:

- single-storey side extension works to improve the ground-floor accommodation and rationalise the layout of the bungalow;
- single-storey front extension/entrance works creating a more legible and usable relationship between the dwelling and the proposed front access;
- a hip-to-gable roof enlargement;
- a rear dormer serving the proposed loft accommodation;
- front-facing rooflights within the plane of the front roof slope;
- retention of the existing single-storey rear-extension roof form so that it can meet the proposed rear dormer and maintain adequate internal ceiling heights;
- patio steps to serve the new patio doors, included transparently in the planning application because raised platforms above 300mm are not permitted development;
- conversion of the front garden area to provide a driveway; and
- a new vehicular access from the B2118, with visibility splays shown on the submitted block plan.

The proposal does not involve the creation of a separate dwelling. It does not introduce any non-residential use. It does not materially intensify the use of the site beyond ordinary family occupation of one dwellinghouse. It is a domestic householder scheme.

The purpose of the householder application is to secure the superior planning and design solution when compared with the LDC fallback. The LDC fallback exists because of a technical GPDO route; the householder application exists because the more appropriate planning solution is to retain the existing rear-extension roof form rather than to lower it artificially.

4. Submitted drawings and factual basis

This statement has been prepared having regard to the submitted existing plans, the householder proposed plans, the proposed LDC Rev B plan and the OS/location and block plan. The key drawing information is summarised below.

Drawing	Relevant information
Existing Plans, Drawing No. 01, Rev 0, June 2026	Shows the existing bungalow layout, established rear addition, existing elevations/section and the existing domestic built form at the site.
Householder Proposed Plans, Drawing No. 02, Rev 0, June 2026	Shows the householder scheme, including the single-storey additions, roof enlargement, rear dormer, front rooflights, proposed internal arrangement and elevations.

Proposed LDC Plans, Drawing No. 02, Rev B, June 2026

Shows the pending LDC fallback scheme and includes roof-volume calculations: hip-to-gable 10.56m³; dormer 31.242m³; total roof enlargement 41.802m³.

Location and Block Plan, Drawing No. 10, Rev 0, June 2026

Shows the site's relationship to the B2118 and the proposed new access/visibility arrangement, including 2.4m x 43m splays in both directions.

The householder proposal should be read alongside the pending LDC because the practical difference between the schemes is critical. The LDC scheme adopts a technical roof-lowering solution to avoid the dormer meeting the pre-existing rear-extension roof. The householder scheme seeks the preferable planning solution by retaining the existing rear-extension roof and preserving usable ceiling heights.

5. The pending LDC fallback and why it matters

A proposed Lawful Development Certificate application is pending at the time of this householder application. The LDC is relied upon as a legitimate fallback position, subject of course to the Council's determination of that application. The applicant does not ask the Council to determine the LDC issue through the householder application. The point is different: the existence of the submitted LDC application demonstrates that a materially similar fallback scheme is being actively pursued and is capable of becoming a lawful alternative if certified.

The LDC scheme includes the same broad domestic objective: enlargement and improvement of the existing bungalow by means of single-storey works, a hip-to-gable roof enlargement, a rear dormer and front rooflights. However, the LDC route has been drawn to address the applicant's understanding of the GPDO technical position. That understanding is that a proposed rear dormer can touch an existing projection in certain circumstances, but that contact with an extension built after 1948 may create technical difficulty because the resultant form may count towards the total enlargement and may project further than the relevant original rear wall. The LDC drawing has therefore been prepared on a conservative basis by altering/lowering the existing rear-extension roof to avoid that physical relationship.

That conservative LDC solution creates an inferior design outcome. It would require the existing rear-extension roof to be artificially lowered or adapted, thereby reducing ceiling heights in both the proposed and existing single-storey accommodation. Such an outcome would not produce a public planning benefit. It would not improve neighbour amenity, it would not improve highway safety, it would not improve the street scene, and it would not produce a more coherent architectural composition. It would simply produce a technical roof geometry to satisfy a permitted-development route.

The householder application is therefore not an attempt to secure a materially greater or more harmful development than the fallback. It is an attempt to secure the better version of that fallback: a version which retains the established rear roof form, preserves usable ceiling heights and avoids unnecessary reconstruction.

The LDC Rev B drawing also demonstrates that the roof enlargement has been calculated by reference to the relevant permitted-development volume control. The drawing states the hip-to-gable volume as 10.56m³ and the rear dormer volume as 31.242m³, giving a total of 41.802m³. This is below the usual 50m³ Class B threshold for a detached or semi-detached dwellinghouse. While the householder application is not itself an LDC application, this calculation is important because it shows that the scale of the proposed roof enlargement is not materially beyond the scale of roof enlargement that the national householder permitted-development regime contemplates in principle for non-terraced dwellings.

The correct planning comparison is therefore not limited to the existing bungalow versus the application scheme. The Council should also compare the application scheme with the realistic LDC fallback. On that comparison, the householder scheme is plainly preferable. It gives rise to no materially greater harm but produces a better internal and external design outcome.

The fallback principle is well established in planning judgement. The Court of Appeal in *Mansell v Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council* confirmed that a fallback can be a material consideration where there is a real prospect of it being implemented; it need not be certain, and the weight to be given to it is a matter for the decision maker. Here, the applicant has gone further than merely asserting a theoretical fallback. A formal LDC application has

been lodged and a detailed Rev B drawing has been prepared. That should attract meaningful weight in the planning balance.

6. Planning policy framework

6.1 Statutory starting point

Planning decisions must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case the relevant material considerations include national planning policy, Mid Sussex design guidance, West Sussex highway guidance, the pending LDC fallback and the practical betterment secured by the householder scheme when compared with that fallback.

6.2 Mid Sussex District Plan - Policy DP26: Character and Design

Policy DP26 requires alterations and extensions to existing buildings to be well designed and to reflect the distinctive character of towns and villages. It also requires development to address the character and scale of surrounding buildings and landscape, avoid significant harm to neighbouring amenities, create safe and accessible layouts, and incorporate parking in a manner that does not dominate the street environment.

The proposal complies with those objectives. It remains domestic in scale and use, retains a roof-dominated front elevation, positions the largest roof enlargement to the rear, uses rooflights on the public-facing roof slope, and can be conditioned to use materials which match or complement the existing dwelling. The proposed driveway and access create a clearer, safer and more legible relationship between the dwelling and the street, rather than perpetuating the existing poor rear-access arrangement.

6.3 Mid Sussex District Plan - Policy DP21: Transport

Policy DP21 requires development proposals to provide adequate car parking, protect the safety of road users and pedestrians, and take account of the transport impact of the proposal. The application remains a single dwelling and does not generate a significant amount of movement. The transport issue is therefore not trip generation; it is whether the access arrangement is safe and suitable.

The proposed access is a betterment over the existing arrangement. It replaces a constrained, narrow and illogical rear track with a direct frontage access. The submitted visibility arrangement shows 2.4m x 43m splays in both directions, which aligns with the usual visibility approach for a 30mph environment under West Sussex guidance.

6.4 Mid Sussex dormer and rooflight guidance

Mid Sussex's Dormer Window and Rooflight Design Guidance recognises that living accommodation in roof space often requires dormer windows, but warns that bulky or prominent dormers can harm the appearance of a building and the street scene. It advises that dormers should be set back, below the ridge, visually subordinate where possible and designed with sympathetic materials.

The applicant acknowledges this guidance. However, the guidance cannot be applied mechanistically. The assessment must consider the site-specific context, the rear location of the dormer, the retained domestic use, the fact that the front elevation uses rooflights rather than a front dormer, and the realistic LDC fallback. In this case, the householder scheme should not be refused simply because the rear dormer is larger than the guidance's preferred model. The question is whether it causes material planning harm. In the context of the fallback and the limited public prominence of the rear roof plane, it does not.

6.5 National Planning Policy Framework - highway matters

The NPPF requires safe and suitable access to be achieved for all users and confirms that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds where there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. That national test is important in a householder case where the proposal remains one dwelling and where the access proposal is essentially a relocation and improvement of an existing domestic access arrangement.

6.6 GPDO context

The GPDO context is relevant in two ways. First, the pending LDC fallback demonstrates a route for a materially similar domestic enlargement, subject to the Council's determination. Secondly, the GPDO explains why certain matters are included in this householder application: raised platforms above 0.3m are not permitted development, and a new access onto a classified road such as the B2118 is appropriately included in the planning application rather than assumed to be permitted development.

7. Design, scale and appearance

7.1 Overall design approach

The proposal has been designed as a coherent domestic improvement to an existing bungalow. It is not a replacement dwelling and not a second dwelling. The design objective is to make the existing house function properly for family occupation by improving the ground-floor layout, making efficient use of the roof space and creating a logical relationship with the site frontage.

The front elevation remains relatively restrained. The roof alteration to the principal/public-facing elevation is limited to rooflights set within the roof slope. This is a materially different visual effect from a front dormer and helps preserve the roof-dominated character of the frontage.

The hip-to-gable alteration is a common and logical form of roof enlargement for dwellings where the existing hipped roof prevents efficient use of the roof space. It enables a practical internal layout without raising the roof ridge above the established roof height.

7.2 Rear dormer

The rear dormer is the principal roof enlargement. It is located to the rear and is therefore materially less prominent in public views than an equivalent front dormer. It would be experienced mainly in the context of the private rear garden and neighbouring rear garden environment. The rear location is a significant mitigating factor in design terms.

It is accepted that the dormer is not a small traditional dormer of the type normally preferred by Mid Sussex guidance. However, the planning balance must go beyond that simple observation. The dormer is necessary to create usable accommodation within the roof space of a bungalow. The LDC fallback demonstrates that a substantial rear roof enlargement is being pursued and is capable of being materially similar in external scale. The issue for the householder application is therefore whether allowing the rear dormer to meet the existing rear-extension roof creates unacceptable harm. It does not.

The dormer can be finished in materials that are recessive and complementary, such as tile hanging or dark cladding, and its windows can be aligned and proportioned to avoid an overly chaotic elevation. A condition requiring matching or sympathetic materials would be reasonable.

7.3 Retention of the existing rear-extension roof

The most important design betterment over the LDC fallback is the retention of the existing single-storey rear-extension roof. The existing roof is already part of the property's built form. The LDC solution would alter or lower it not because that would be architecturally better, but because it seeks to avoid a technical permitted-development issue caused by the dormer meeting the post-1948 rear extension.

Lowering the roof would create a visibly contrived junction and would compromise internal ceiling heights. Maintaining the existing roof is therefore a better planning outcome. It keeps the established style of the rear extension, avoids unnecessary structural alteration, and provides a more satisfactory standard of accommodation.

The Council should give this point substantial weight. Planning should not prefer an inferior technical solution where a better design can be approved without causing material harm. The householder application provides the Council with the opportunity to secure the better outcome.

7.4 Comparison with the LDC fallback

The householder proposal is materially similar to the LDC fallback in its broad planning effects. Both involve domestic extensions and roof enlargement to the same bungalow. Both would alter the rear roofscape. Both would

improve the internal accommodation. The important difference is that the LDC route lowers/adapts the rear-extension roof while the householder scheme keeps it.

That difference should be treated as a design betterment. It does not materially increase public visual harm, because the retained rear-extension roof already exists. It does not increase the number of dwellings or traffic generation. It does not create a new overlooking platform. It simply avoids an artificial reduction in ceiling height and a contrived roof separation.

On that comparative planning exercise, the householder scheme is the superior scheme. It is more honest architecturally, better functionally and no more harmful materially.

8. Residential amenity

The proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. The use remains residential and domestic. No separate dwelling is created. No commercial or intensified non-residential activity is introduced.

The single-storey elements remain within the domestic curtilage and are read against the existing bungalow and existing rear addition. The application does not introduce a form of development that would be overbearing or oppressive when assessed against neighbouring dwellings.

The rear dormer would face primarily towards the rear garden environment. Any side-facing loft windows, if present or required, can be conditioned to be obscure glazed and non-opening below 1.7m above finished floor level. Such a condition would be consistent with normal permitted-development safeguards for roof enlargements and would prevent unacceptable overlooking.

The patio steps would provide access only. They would not function as a balcony, roof terrace or elevated amenity platform. If the Council has concern on this point, a condition can require the steps to be constructed only as shown and not extended or used as a raised terrace without further permission.

The development would therefore preserve acceptable privacy, outlook and daylight conditions for neighbouring occupiers.

9. New driveway and vehicular access from the B2118

9.1 Existing access problem

The existing access arrangement is a major weakness of the site. Vehicles currently use Furzeland Way and then a narrow, constrained track which approaches the rear garden. This is a poor arrangement for a family dwelling. It is not legible, it is not convenient, it does not provide meaningful turning, and it is not suitable for the normal movement of a large family car.

The current situation is therefore not a neutral baseline. It is an existing deficiency. The planning application provides an opportunity to resolve that deficiency by forming a direct access and driveway at the logical frontage of the property.

9.2 Proposed access and visibility

The proposed access from the B2118 would create a clear, direct and practical relationship between the dwelling, its entrance and the highway. The submitted location and block plan shows the proposed access arrangement and visibility splays of 2.4m x 43m in both directions.

West Sussex County Council's Local Design Guide explains that visibility is assessed using X and Y distances, that a 2.4m X-distance is usually appropriate in existing built-up residential areas, and that the Y-distance should be at least equal to the relevant stopping sight distance. Its table gives 43m as the typical SSD-adjusted visibility distance for a 30mph environment.

On that basis, the submitted access arrangement has been designed to meet the normal 30mph visibility expectation. If the Highway Authority requires any minor technical refinement at the vehicle crossover stage, that can be dealt with by condition or through the separate highway licence process. It would not justify refusal of the planning application in principle.

9.3 Highway safety and traffic generation

The development remains one dwelling. It does not create a new residential unit and does not introduce a use that would generate a significant number of additional vehicle movements. The proposal changes the way the existing dwelling is accessed; it does not materially increase the level of traffic associated with the site.

The NPPF highway test is therefore readily satisfied. Safe and suitable access can be achieved, and there would be no unacceptable impact on highway safety and no severe residual cumulative impact on the road network. The proposal also accords with Policy DP21 because it provides a safer and more practical domestic access and off-street parking arrangement.

In planning terms, the access proposal is a net benefit. It removes reliance on a narrow and contrived rear track and replaces it with a direct, visible and purpose-designed frontage access. That is better for the occupiers, more legible for visitors and more logical in urban-design terms.

10. Front garden driveway, drainage and landscaping

The conversion of part of the front garden to a driveway is acceptable in principle. Domestic driveways are a normal feature of residential streets, particularly where they provide off-street parking and improve the functionality of a family dwelling.

The key planning considerations are visual appearance, drainage and highway safety. These matters can be controlled satisfactorily. The driveway can be surfaced in permeable materials or drained to a permeable area within the site so that surface water does not discharge onto the highway. Any frontage planting can be designed so that it does not interfere with the visibility splays.

The driveway should not be treated as harmful simply because it changes the front garden. The existing access is poor and constrained. A carefully designed front driveway is the correct functional response to the site. It would improve the relationship between the dwelling and its frontage and provide safe, convenient off-street parking.

11. Patio steps

The application includes steps to the proposed patio doors. This is intentional and transparent. Raised platforms above 0.3m are not permitted development under the householder permitted-development regime, so the applicant has properly included the steps within the planning application rather than attempting to rely on permitted-development rights.

The steps are access infrastructure. They are not a balcony, roof terrace or elevated seating deck. Their function is to allow safe movement between the dwelling and garden. They would not materially increase overlooking beyond normal use of the garden and patio doors.

If necessary, a condition can require the steps to be retained only as access steps and not enlarged into a raised terrace or platform without further planning permission.

12. Response to likely concerns

Potential issue	Planning response
Concern 1: The rear dormer is larger than Mid Sussex guidance normally prefers.	Response: The guidance is a material consideration but not an absolute rule. The dormer is to the rear, the front elevation is served by rooflights, the ridge is not raised, and the LDC fallback demonstrates that a materially similar roof enlargement is realistic. The householder scheme should be judged by actual planning harm, not by a mechanical comparison with a preferred dormer typology.
Concern 2: The dormer meets the roof of a post-1948 rear extension.	Response: That is precisely why a householder planning application has been submitted. The application does not ask the Council to certify the

scheme as permitted development. It asks the Council to make a planning-merits decision. Retaining the existing rear-extension roof creates a better design and better internal accommodation than the technical LDC fallback.

Concern 3: The householder scheme is different from the LDC fallback.

Response: The schemes need not be identical for the fallback to be relevant. The correct question is whether the fallback is realistic and whether the application scheme is better or worse in planning terms. Here, the householder scheme is materially similar in overall domestic scale and effect but superior in design because it avoids lowering the rear-extension roof.

Concern 4: The new access is onto the B2118.

Response: The B2118 access is included within the application and is supported by visibility splays shown at 2.4m x 43m in both directions. The development remains one dwelling and does not materially increase traffic generation. The proposal replaces a poor rear access with a direct and purpose-designed frontage access.

Concern 5: The front garden would become a driveway.

Response: A front driveway is a normal domestic feature and is justified by the poor existing access arrangement. Drainage, surfacing, visibility and landscaping can be controlled by condition.

Concern 6: The patio steps could be a raised platform.

Response: The steps are functional access steps, not a balcony or terrace. They are included in the planning application because the applicant recognises that raised platforms above 0.3m are not permitted development. Their use and form can be controlled by condition.

13. Suggested planning conditions

Without prejudice to the applicant's position that the proposal is acceptable as submitted, the following conditions would be reasonable if the Council considers that additional control is required:

1. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings.
2. External materials for the extensions and roof enlargement to match or closely complement the existing dwelling.
3. Any side-facing loft windows to be obscure glazed and non-opening below 1.7m above finished floor level.
4. The approved visibility splays to be provided before the new access is first brought into use and thereafter retained free from obstruction above the agreed height.
5. The first section of the driveway adjoining the highway to be surfaced in a bound material, if required by the Highway Authority.
6. No surface water from the driveway to discharge onto the public highway.
7. Any gates to be set back from the highway and to open inwards only.
8. The patio steps to be constructed only as shown on the approved drawings and not enlarged into a raised terrace, balcony or platform without further planning permission.
9. Soft landscaping/planting details to be implemented where necessary to soften the frontage while preserving visibility splays.

14. Planning balance and conclusion

The application should be approved when assessed against the development plan and all material considerations. The proposal remains a domestic householder scheme for one existing bungalow. It provides improved family accommodation, a more coherent internal layout, a better roof relationship and a safer, more logical access arrangement.

The pending LDC fallback is central to the planning balance. The applicant has submitted a materially similar fallback scheme. The fallback includes a hip-to-gable roof enlargement and rear dormer with a calculated total roof enlargement of 41.802m³. The fallback has had to adopt a technical roof-lowering solution to avoid the dormer meeting the post-1948 rear extension. That technical solution would compromise ceiling heights and produce an inferior outcome.

The householder application is the preferable solution. It retains the existing rear-extension roof style, allows the proposed dormer to meet it in a logical manner, protects usable ceiling heights and avoids unnecessary reconstruction. There is no meaningful public planning benefit in forcing the applicant to implement the inferior LDC roof arrangement if planning permission can be granted for the better scheme now before the Council.

The design concerns that may ordinarily arise from a substantial rear dormer are outweighed by the site-specific circumstances. The dormer is to the rear, the front roof slope uses rooflights rather than a dormer, the scheme remains a single dwelling, and the fallback demonstrates that a materially similar roof enlargement is realistic. The proposal would not cause unacceptable harm to character, appearance or neighbouring amenity.

The access proposal is also strongly positive. The existing Furzeland Way/rear-track access is narrow, contrived and unsuitable for normal family-car use. The proposed B2118 access gives the dwelling a direct, visible and logical frontage access with 2.4m x 43m visibility splays. The development does not materially increase traffic generation and satisfies the NPPF highway test.

For these reasons, the proposal accords with the development plan when read as a whole. Insofar as any aspect is considered to depart from normal householder design guidance, the pending LDC fallback, the betterment achieved by retaining the existing rear-extension roof, the improved access arrangement and the absence of material harm are compelling material considerations in favour of granting planning permission.

Planning permission should therefore be granted.

15. Source and policy references

Reference	Source
[1]	Mid Sussex District Council, Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031, adopted 28 March 2018. Relevant policies include DP21: Transport and DP26: Character and Design.
[2]	Mid Sussex District Council, Dormer Window and Rooflight Design Guidance. The guidance is material to roof alterations and dormers and is to be read with Policy DP26.
[3]	Mid Sussex District Council, Supplementary and Other Planning Documents page, identifying the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD as adopted guidance covering residential extensions.
[4]	National Planning Policy Framework, December 2024, especially paragraphs 115-116 on safe and suitable access and the highway-safety refusal threshold.
[5]	West Sussex County Council, Local Design Guide,

version 1.1. Relevant guidance includes X/Y visibility splays, 2.4m X-distance in existing built-up residential areas and 43m SSD-adjusted visibility for 30mph.

[6]

GOV.UK, Permitted development rights for householders: technical guidance. Relevant to Class B roof enlargement context and the definition of raised platforms above 0.3m.

[7]

Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, Schedule 2, Part 2, Class B: means of access to a highway. Relevant to the planning status of access works to trunk/classified roads.

[8]

Mansell v Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council [2017] EWCA Civ 1314. Relevant to the fallback principle and the weight that can be given to a realistic alternative development route.

Appendix A - submitted drawing list relied upon

- Existing Plans, Drawing No. 01, Rev 0, June 2026: Shows the existing bungalow layout, established rear addition, existing elevations/section and the existing domestic built form at the site.
- Householder Proposed Plans, Drawing No. 02, Rev 0, June 2026: Shows the householder scheme, including the single-storey additions, roof enlargement, rear dormer, front rooflights, proposed internal arrangement and elevations.
- Proposed LDC Plans, Drawing No. 02, Rev B, June 2026: Shows the pending LDC fallback scheme and includes roof-volume calculations: hip-to-gable 10.56m³; dormer 31.242m³; total roof enlargement 41.802m³.
- Location and Block Plan, Drawing No. 10, Rev 0, June 2026: Shows the site's relationship to the B2118 and the proposed new access/visibility arrangement, including 2.4m x 43m splays in both directions.

Applicant note

This statement is drafted on the basis that the LDC remains pending at the time of submission. If the LDC is granted before the householder application is determined, the Council is respectfully asked to give the fallback increased weight as a certified lawful alternative. If the LDC remains pending at the time of determination, the Council is still asked to treat it as an active and realistic fallback, having regard to the detailed submitted Rev B plan and the applicant's clear intention to pursue that route if necessary.