

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/1003	Case Officer:	Catherine Cardin
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed demolition of an existing building and the erection of a detached single storey annexe, ancillary to main dwelling, together with the formation of new parking spaces and associated landscaping.		
Site:	Bentley Cottage, Wickham Hill, Hurstpierpoint, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9NP, ,		
Validation Date	24 Apr 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	10 Jun 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	12 Jun 2026
Target Date:	19 Jun 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:	12 Jun 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/1003

**Bentley Cottage, Wickham Hill, Hurstpierpoint, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9NP,
Proposed demolition of an existing building and the erection of a detached single storey annexe,
ancillary to main dwelling, together with the formation of new parking spaces and associated
landscaping.**

Dr Michael Acton

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Nature Space

Thank you for consulting us on this application. It is considered that the proposed development would present a low risk to great crested newts and/or their habitats.

Southern Water

No objection.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

The Committee recommends that MSDC grant permission.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of an existing building and the erection of a detached single storey annexe, ancillary to the main dwelling, together with the formation of new parking spaces and associated landscaping.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/25/2684- Demolish existing garden room and replace with new for ancillary use to the main dwelling. Permission.

DM/25/2691- Rear extension. Internal alterations. Alterations to South elevation. Decking to rear elevation with steps down to garden level. Replacing window to existing kitchen with french doors and glass handrail. Permission.

DM/26/0311- Demolish existing building to rear. Proposed erection of a two-storey rear extension. Alterations to South elevation. Decking to rear elevation with steps down to garden level and high privacy screen. Replacing window to existing kitchen with French doors and glass handrail. Addition of a log burner and flue. Permission.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Bentley Cottage is a detached two storey dwelling. It is constructed of red brick, with a plain tile roof and white fenestration. The property is characterised by tile hanging to the first-floor elevation and a gabled front projection. The property benefits from an attached garage and off-road parking to the front of the property. The property has several outbuildings to the side and rear of the property.

The property is located within the built-up area boundary of Hurstpierpoint. Neighbouring properties are located to the east and west. The highway lies to the south, whilst open countryside is located to the north.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of an existing building and the erection of a detached single storey annexe, ancillary to the main dwelling, together with the formation of new parking spaces and associated landscaping.

The proposed annexe would be ancillary to the main dwellinghouse and located on the eastern side of the dwelling. The annexe would measure approximately 10.9 metres in width and 9.2 metres in depth and would be served by a pitched roof with gabled projection, with an approximate height to the ridge of 5.8 metres and an eaves height of 4.2 metres. The front (southern) elevation would include three windows and French doors. The rear (northern) elevation would comprise two French doors serving a terrace, and a window. The side (western) elevation would incorporate two windows. The annexe would provide a main bedroom with ensuite, a carers bedroom with ensuite, a main living room with kitchen/diner and a rear terrace. Submitted plans show that it is proposed to erect a terrace to the rear (northern) end of the annexe. This would measure approximately 5.7 metres in width and 3.5 metres in depth. This would incorporate steps leading down the rear garden. The annexe would be constructed of black timber weatherboarding and bricks, with slate roof tiles and casement windows.

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 Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common 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:

DP21 - Transport

DP26 - Character and Design

DP27 - Dwelling Space Standards

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

Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan made in 2015.

Relevant policies:

No relevant policies.

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

DPT4 - Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure

DPH11 - Dwelling Space Standards

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)

Nationally Described Space Standards

ASSESSMENT

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

- Design and impact on the character of the area
- Neighbouring amenities
- Dwelling space standards
- Parking arrangements
- Other matters
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Design and impact on the character of the area

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 also contains principles to protect the character of the area and neighbouring amenity. It 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".*

The proposal seeks to demolish an existing outbuilding and erect a single-storey annexe to the east of the host dwelling, within the built-up area boundary of Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common. The annexe would be accessed from the existing private road, set approximately 3.7 metres back from it, with parking provided to the front.

Bentley Cottage is a two-storey dwelling with first-floor accommodation within the roof space. The property was recently granted planning permission for a two-storey rear extension. The proposed annexe would provide approximately 88 sqm of floorspace and would appear as a relatively modest, single-storey addition when viewed in the context of the overall site.

Whilst detached, the annexe is considered comparable in design terms to a subordinate domestic outbuilding. In terms of design, the annexe would incorporate a simple pitched roof form which reflects the character of the host dwelling. The scale, form and layout are considered appropriate and would ensure that the main dwelling remains the dominant and legible building within the site. The proposed materials, comprising black timber weatherboarding, brick and slate roof tiles, together with white fenestration are evident within the wider street scene and would result in a cohesive and sympathetic appearance. The separation from the host dwelling and subordinate scale ensure the annexe reads as a secondary structure within the plot rather than a competing primary built form.

Overall, the proposal is considered to be of an appropriate scale, form and design and would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the site or surrounding area. It is therefore considered to comply with Policy DP26 of the District Plan and the relevant principles of the Mid Sussex Design Guide.

Whilst the annexe contains facilities that could support independent day-to-day living, it would remain functionally and physically linked to the host dwelling. It would share access, parking and services, and no separate planning unit or curtilage is proposed. Furthermore, the absence of a clear physical or legal subdivision of the site would limit its ability to operate as a separate unit. The ancillary relationship would be secured by condition. The provision of a condition restricting occupation to ancillary purposes is both necessary and reasonable to prevent the formation of a separate planning unit.

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'*.

To the east of the application site lies The Haven. A separation distance of approximately 22 metres would be maintained. It is considered that the proposed annexe would be situated at a sufficient distance so as not to affect their light, outlook or privacy. In addition, the buildings would be oriented away from each other, with an area of intervening garden land between them. Given the intervening distance, orientation and single-storey scale, the proposal would not give rise to harmful overlooking, loss of light or an overbearing impact. Given the domestic nature of the proposal there would not be significant harm in terms of noise, air or light pollution.

Dwelling space standards

Policy DP27 of the District Plan states that all new residential development should comply with minimum nationally described space standards for internal floor space and storage.

Whilst the annexe is not proposed as a separate dwelling, it is noted that the level of accommodation would exceed the minimum space standards applicable to a two-bedroom dwelling. The proposed annexe would provide approximately 88 sqm of internal floorspace. A minimum floor area of 70 sqm with 2 sqm of built in storage is recommended for a single storey dwelling with 2 bedrooms (4 bed spaces). The proposal would therefore exceed the minimum requirement, and this indicates that the living conditions would be acceptable.

Accordingly, the proposal would meet the requirements of the Technical Housing Standards and therefore comply with DP27 of the District Plan.

Parking arrangements

Policy DP21 of the District Plan states that to meet the objectives of the West Sussex Transport Plan 2011- 2026, decisions on development proposals will take account of whether: *'the scheme provides adequate car parking for the proposed development taking into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the development and the availability and opportunities for public transport; and with the relevant Neighbourhood Plan where applicable;*.

The host dwelling is a three-bedroom property. Whilst the proposal introduces additional ancillary accommodation, it would not result in the creation of a separate planning unit or independent dwelling.

West Sussex County Council Parking Standards Guidance (2020) indicates that a 3-bedroom dwelling in this location should provide 3 parking spaces. The proposal would retain three spaces serving the main dwelling and introduce an additional four spaces to the front of the annexe. Whilst the annexe does not constitute a separate dwelling, the additional parking provision is considered appropriate to support the enlarged household and avoid displacement onto the highway. The site layout demonstrates that sufficient space is available for vehicles to manoeuvre within the site.

Overall, the proposal is considered to provide adequate parking provision and would not result in harm to highway safety, in accordance with Policy DP21 of the District Plan.

Other matters

The Council is subject to the Public Sector Equality Duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 and must have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between persons who share protected characteristics and those who do not.

The proposed annexe is intended to accommodate the applicant's brother-in-law, who has been diagnosed with dementia, together with his wife, and supporting information has been submitted in this regard. The development would provide improved living arrangements to meet his needs.

Having regard to the above, it is considered that the proposal has been assessed in accordance with the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty.

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. The development constitutes householder development and is therefore exempt from the statutory requirement to deliver 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 development would comply with the requirements of policies DP21, DP26 and DP27 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

The proposal is therefore considered acceptable and recommended for approval.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Catherine Cardin