

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/0248	Case Officer:	Catherine Cardin
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed single storey front extension, two storey rear extension, new window/fenestration and alterations, roof alterations and new solar panels to roof.		
Site:	New Farm House, 1 Stanford Avenue, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 8JL, , ,		
Validation Date	4 Feb 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	22 Apr 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	1 May 2026
Target Date:	1 Apr 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Catherine Cardin

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	1
---	--	------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	4 May 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/0248

**New Farm House, 1 Stanford Avenue, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 8JL, ,
Proposed single storey front extension, two storey rear extension, new window/fenestration and alterations, roof alterations and new solar panels to roof.
Mr And Mrs Newton**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

One neighbouring resident submitted three representations raising concerns relating to:

- Overbearing impact
- Loss of light
- Impact to boundary fence from soil push
- High hedge
- Character and Design

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Southern Water

No objection.

MSDC Tree Officer

No objection.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

The committee recommend that permission is granted.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought for a single storey front extension, two storey rear extension, new window/fenestration and alterations, roof alterations and new solar panels to roof.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

04/02919/FUL- Demolition of existing property and erection of 12 flats. Refused.

05/00943/FUL- Demolition of existing property and erection of a new hipped roof block for 10 flats with dormer windows on all elevations (7 no. 1 bed and 3 no. 2 bed flats). Refused.

05/02776/FUL- Demolition of existing house and garage. Erection of new block for 8 no flats. Refused.

09/03074/FUL- Demolition of existing concrete section garage to the rear of the property including the closure of a rear driveway access to the highway. Construction of a detached double garage to the front of the property, accessed by an existing front highway entrance. Withdrawn.

10/01559/LDC- Construction of a single storey rear extension. This is an application to establish whether the development is lawful: this will be a legal decision where the planning merits of the proposed use cannot be taken into account. Permission.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

New Farm House is a detached two storey dwelling. The property is characterised by white painted brick, white timber fenestration and a plain tile roof. The property benefits from two driveways, one to the north and one to the south of the application site, with off street parking to accommodate approximately four cars.

The property occupies a corner plot and is located within the built-up area boundary of Hassocks. Neighbouring properties are located to the north and west. Highway is located to the east and south. The site slopes gently to the north.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposed single storey front extension would measure some 3.3 metres in width and some 1.5 metres in depth. This would have a pitched roof with a maximum height of some 2.9 metres and a height to the eaves of some 2.3 metres. This would have a window and bifold doors on the front (southern) elevation, a Velux window on the front (southern) pitch. This would be finished in external materials to match the existing. It is proposed to use this as a kitchen.

The proposed two storey rear extension would measure some 2.4 metres in width and some 6.8 metres in depth. This would have a dual pitched roof with a maximum height of some 7.1 metres and a height to the eaves of some 5.2 metres. It is proposed to install one window on the rear (northern) elevation and one window on the side (eastern) elevation at first floor level. It is also proposed to install three windows on the rear (northern) elevation at ground floor level. The extension would be finished in external materials to match the existing. It is proposed to use this as a bathroom and bedroom on the first floor and as a utility, porch and W.C on the ground floor.

It is also proposed to construct a porch on the (rear) elevation. This would measure some 2.7 metres in width and some 1.2 metres in depth. This would have a pitched roof with a maximum height of some 3.8 metres and a height to the eaves of some 2.7 metres. This would have oak posts and plain tiles to match the existing.

Finally, it is proposed to install solar panels on the front (southern) roof pitch and the side (western) roof pitch.

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 Hassocks 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.

Relevant policies:
No relevant policies

Neighbourhood Plan

The Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan was made on 24 June 2020.

Relevant policies:

Policy 9 - Character and 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 hearings were concluded on the 19th March 2026. The District Plan remains at Examination until the Inspector has published his report, until that time 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

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

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.

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 DG50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide relates to front extensions and states:

'Front extensions are more likely to be acceptable where the building line is staggered or where the dwelling is set well back from the road. They are less likely to be acceptable in streets with a strong consistent building form as they risk disrupting the underlying order. Where front extensions are considered acceptable, they should normally be limited to a modest single storey or porch-type extension that reflect the character of the existing property.'

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 Hassocks.

Initial concerns were raised regarding the relationship between the front porch and main entrance, as the previously proposed door position did not relate well to the existing elevation. During the course of the application, amended plans were submitted relocating the door from the side (northern) elevation to the front (eastern) elevation.

Although the porch projects beyond the side (eastern) elevation at ground floor level, its modest scale, pitched roof design and subordinate appearance enable it to integrate successfully with the host dwelling.

The proposed two storey extension and rear extension are of an appropriate scale, form and design that would complement the existing dwelling. While the extensions would be visible in the street scene, the dual pitched roof form of the two storey element reflects the character of the host dwelling and ensures that the original dwelling remains the dominant and legible feature.

The use of matching external materials would achieve a coherent appearance and preserve the character and visual amenity of the surrounding area.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy DP26 of the District Plan, policy 9 of the Hassocks 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 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan requires that proposals do not *'cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings, including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight, sunlight and security'*;

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 9 of the Hassocks 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.

Initial concerns were raised regarding the potential for overbearing impact and loss of privacy arising from the proposed two storey extension. During the course of the application, revised plans were submitted reducing the depth of the two-storey element so that it aligns with the existing northern elevation of the building. The internal layout was also revised, with the bedroom window reoriented to face east and the family bathroom located to the rear, served by a first-floor obscured-glazed window.

The neighbouring property to the north, The Holies, is a single-storey bungalow. The proposal would extend the built form closer to this boundary, resulting in a side-rear relationship. However, a separation distance of approximately 6 metres would be maintained between the two storey extension and the neighbour's flank wall. Given this distance, together with the single-storey height of the neighbouring dwelling, it is not considered that the development would result in an unacceptable loss of light or outlook or appear unduly overbearing. While a limited increase in the sense of enclosure would occur, this is considered to fall within acceptable planning tolerances.

In terms of overlooking, the proposed first-floor window on the rear (northern) elevation would serve a bathroom and would be fitted with obscure glazing, as shown on the submitted plans. The neighbouring property contains two windows on its southern elevation, one of which is already obscure glazed. Having regard to this separation distance, relative orientation and window positioning, it is not considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable overlooking or a material loss of privacy to the occupants of The Hollies.

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 significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore deemed to accord with the above-mentioned part of policy DP26 of the District Plan.

Other matters

Concerns have been raised regarding soil pushing against a boundary edge and the presence of a high hedge.

With regard to concern about soil levels, the submitted plans do not indicate any increase in finished ground levels adjacent to the shared boundary. Matters relating to construction techniques, temporary ground disturbance, or land stability during the build process are not material planning considerations and are appropriately dealt with under separate legislation, such as building regulations or civil legislation, where necessary. Should any damage occur during construction, this would be a private matter between landowners.

In respect of the reference to a high hedge, this is not a matter that can be afforded weight in the determination of this application. Issues relating to high hedges are controlled under separate legislation and fall outside of the scope of the planning process.

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 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 E9 of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan. It is therefore considered acceptable.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Catherine Cardin