

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/1130	Case Officer:	Catherine Cardin
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed single storey side/rear extension		
Site:	19 St Andrews Place, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9QE, , , ,		
Validation Date	30 Jun 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	24 Jul 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	14 Aug 2026
Target Date:	25 Aug 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Catherine Cardin</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	19 Aug 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/1130

**19 St Andrews Place, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9QE, , ,
Proposed single storey side/rear extension
Mrs K Sweeney**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

MSDC Drainage and Flood Risk

No objection.

Southern Water

No objection.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

The committee recommend permission is granted.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for a single storey side/rear extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/16/1775- Comprehensive redevelopment comprising: up to 130 residential units; replacement golf clubhouse; new driving range; new golf holes; new maintenance store; strategic landscaping; and associated drainage and access works.

DM/18/2616- Comprehensive redevelopment of the site comprising of 165 residential units (Use Class C3), landscaping, car parking and associated drainage and access works. Amended plans received 26 October showing revised elevations, street scenes and landscaping. Permission.

DM/19/1893- To divert the existing Public Right of Way - Footpath FP9 crossing the former Hassocks Golf Club. Permission.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application property is a detached two storey dwelling. The property is characterised by red brick, white uPVC fenestration and a plain tiled roof.

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

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposal seeks permission for a single storey side/rear extension. The extension would measure approximately 7 metres in width and 4.1 metres in depth. This would incorporate a pitched roof with a ridge height of approximately 3.7 metres and an eaves height of approximately 2.4 metres. Sliding doors

are proposed on the rear (southern) elevation. Four rooflights are proposed, with two rooflights on each roof pitch. The extension would be finished in external materials to match the host property.

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

DP41- Flood Risk and Drainage

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

The Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan was made on 24 June 2020.

Relevant policies:

Policy 5: Enabling Zero Carbon

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 is currently at Examination with initial hearings held in February/March 2026. The Council is consulting on Main Modifications which are required to ensure the plan is legally compliant and sound. 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) (August 2026)

ASSESSMENT

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

- Character and Design
- Neighbouring amenity
- Flood risk and drainage
- Sustainable design
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Character and Design

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 9 of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan sets out a similar requirement, seeking well-designed development that respects the character of the area.

Principle DG49 of the MSDC Design Guide requires extensions to be well related to the original dwelling and informed by local character. Extensions should be subordinate to, and integrated with, the existing building in terms of scale, form and massing, ensuring that the original dwelling remains the dominant element. Simple building forms are encouraged, along with the alignment of window and door patterns and the use of matching or otherwise appropriate materials. Proposals should also avoid causing significant loss of private amenity space.

Principle DG50 relates to side extensions and advises that they should normally be subservient and set back from the principal elevation. It also highlights the importance of gaps between dwellings in contributing to the rhythm and character of a street, and advises against development that would close important gaps or views.

Principle DG51 relates to rear extensions and notes that while they can take a variety of forms, they should respect the character of the host dwelling and its relationship with neighbouring properties and boundaries.

The application site lies within a modern housing development within the built-up area boundary of Hassocks.

The proposed side/rear extension would be of an appropriate scale, form and design, remaining subordinate to the host dwelling, and it would not result in the loss of an important gap or interrupt the established pattern of development. The incorporation of a pitched roof reflects the architectural form of the existing property and assists in maintaining visual coherence. Whilst the extension would not be set back from the front elevation, due to the presence of an established boundary treatment along the western side, it would not appear incongruous or harmful to the street scene in this instance.

It is acknowledged that the extension would be visible from public vantage points. However, by virtue of its modest scale, subordinate relationship to the host dwelling, and use of matching materials, it would

not appear unduly prominent, dominant or visually intrusive within the street scene. As such, it would not result in material harm to the character or appearance of the surrounding area or the wider development.

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.

Neighbouring amenity

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 conflicts 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.

To the south of the application site are nos.1 and no.3 St. Andrews Place. Given the single-storey scale and the separation distance of approximately 16.3 metres, the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the light and outlook of these neighbouring properties. Whilst sliding doors are proposed on the rear (southern) elevation, given the existing arrangement, it is not considered that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the privacy of these neighbours.

To the east of the application site is 17 St Andrews Place. Given the single storey nature of the proposal, and that a separation distance of 5.6 metres would be retained, the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the light and outlook of this neighbouring property. As no windows are proposed on the side elevation, it is not considered that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the privacy of this neighbour.

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 and accords with Policy 9 of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan and the above-mentioned part of policy DP26 of the District Plan.

Flood risk and drainage

Policy DP41 relates to flood risk and drainage and requires development to demonstrate it is safe across its lifetime and not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. It states in part that:

'Proposals for development will need to follow a sequential risk-based approach, ensure development is safe across its lifetime and not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. The District Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) should be used to identify areas at present and future flood risk from a range of sources including fluvial (rivers and streams), surface water (pluvial), groundwater, infrastructure and reservoirs.'

Particular attention will be paid to those areas of the District that have experienced flooding in the past and proposals for development should seek to reduce the risk of flooding by achieving a reduction from existing run-off rates.'

The site is at very low risk of fluvial flooding and the site falls within areas of surface water flood risk ranging from "Very Low" to "High". MSDC drainage engineers were consulted on the application and provided a response. The proposed development is classified as minor development with no increase in vulnerability and falls within the scope of the Environment Agency's Standing Advice. Based on the information available, the Flood Risk and Drainage Team has no objection to the proposed development on flood risk grounds.

Having regard to the scale of the development, the standing advice, and the response from the Council's Flood Risk and Drainage Team, the proposal is considered acceptable in flood risk and drainage terms and complies with Policy DP41.

Sustainable design

Policy 5 of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan states:

'Development proposals will be supported that maximise the opportunity to include sustainable design features, providing any adverse local impacts can be made acceptable'.

The proposed side/rear extension would be constructed in materials to match the existing dwelling. A renewable energy source has not been included within the proposal nor any other energy saving measures, however the development would need to meet building regulation standards, and it is not considered that this would warrant the refusal of the proposal.

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.

Overall, the proposal accords with Policies DP26 and DP41 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and Policies 5 and 9 of the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan. The proposal is acceptable in terms of character and appearance, neighbouring amenity, flood risk and drainage.

It is therefore considered acceptable.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Catherine Cardin