

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/1404	Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed single storey rear extension, window alterations to the front and rear elevations, replacement of roof tiles with slate tiles, sun tunnel to rear roof slope, replacement of rear lean to with a single storey pergola, replacement of greenhouse and raised planters with an open carport and raised patio and the installation of an external air conditioning unit		
Site:	140 High Street, Hurstpierpoint, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9PX, , ,		
Validation Date	23 Jun 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	27 Jul 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	17 Aug 2026
Target Date:	18 Aug 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Stefan Galyas</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/26/1404

**140 High Street, Hurstpierpoint, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9PX, ,
Proposed single storey rear extension, window alterations to the front and rear elevations,
replacement of roof tiles with slate tiles, sun tunnel to rear roof slope, replacement of rear lean to
with a single storey pergola, replacement of greenhouse and raised planters with an open carport
and raised patio and the installation of an external air conditioning unit
Mr Simon Payne**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

There were no letters of representation received in response to the application.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Conservation Officer: *'In summary, subject to confirmation of the nature of the proposed works to the front windows and to further detail, the works are considered acceptable in terms of their impact on the character and appearance of 140 High Street and the wider Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area. This will meet the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35 (Conservation Areas) and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.'*

MSDC Drainage: Recommend approval.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

The committee recommends that MSDC grant permission

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for the development of a single storey rear extension, window alterations to the front and rear elevations, replacement roof tiles, a sun tunnel to the rear roof slope, replacement of the rear lean to with a single storey pergola, replacement of the greenhouse and raised planters with an open carport and the installation of an air source heat pump (ASHP).

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

There is no recent history of planning applications relating to the site.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application relates to 140 High Street, a two-storey mid terraced dwelling featuring a pitched roof. The existing dwelling has a two-storey half gable which is shared with the adjoining neighbouring property to the west at No.138. A timber built lean to has also been developed to adjoin the projecting rear gable. The rear garden amenity space projects back in a linear plot form and steps up incrementally in ground floor level moving to the rear. An existing single storey greenhouse outbuilding is set towards the rear of the site as well as a raised allotment. In terms of existing materials, the dwelling is composed of brickwork and white painted render walls, concrete roof tiles, white painted single glazed timber windows to the front and white uPVC casement windows to the rear.

In terms of the sites locality, there are a number of other two storey terraced dwellings set within the sites locality which use brickwork to the front and render to the rear. Some dwellings appear to have been extended at single storey level to their rear elevations of time.

With regard to policy constraints, the site is located within the Hurstpierpoint built up area. The site is also positioned within the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area and there is an existing tree subject to a tree preservation order to the south-west of the site. The grade II listed terrace running from 159 to 173 High Street is located to the opposite side of the highway to the north of the site.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposed development would demolish the existing single storey timber lean to element on the existing rear elevation as well as the existing greenhouse within the rear garden.

To the rear elevation, a new single storey lean to infill extension which would measure at approximately 2m in depth, 2.1m wide, 2.6m high to the eaves and 3.4m to the highest point of the roof slope. The proposed infill would be composed of white render to the walls, a glazed roof with anthracite aluminium frames, a double glazed timber French door and black cast iron rainwater goods.

Partly in the same position as the existing single storey rear lean to, a new single storey pergola would be developed. This would measure at circa 3m in length, 3m wide and 2.5m high. The proposed pergola would be composed of aluminium in graphite grey.

To the rear of the garden, a new single storey open carport would be developed. This would measure at approximately 6.5m in length, 5.3m wide and 2.8m in maximum height. The carport would be constructed of hit and miss horizontal timber cladding and roofing felt. A new stepped access would be developed leading up to the car port moving south as well as a new hard landscaped patio area all finished in permeable paving. A new ASHP would also be added to the northern side of the carport.

The proposed development would also replace the existing concrete roof tiles to the main dwelling with slate as well as adding a sun tunnel to the rear roof slope. Furthermore, the existing uPVC casement windows and single glazed timber sash windows would be replaced. To the front the timber sash windows would be replaced with upgraded slim-line vacuum glazing with the window frames to remain as existing. To the rear, the existing uPVC casement windows would be replaced with double glazed conservation style uPVC white framed sash windows. A new tri-fold double glazed timber door with white frames would be added the rear of the projecting gable element at ground floor level.

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 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

DP29: Noise, Air and Light Pollution

DP35: Conservation Areas

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.

There are no relevant policies.

Neighbourhood Plan

Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan (February 2015)

None relevant.

Mid Sussex District Plan 2021-2039 Consultation Draft

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:

DPS1 - Climate Change

DPS2 - Sustainable Design and Construction

DPS4 - Flood Risk and Drainage

DPN6 - Pollution

DPN7- Noise Impacts

DPB1 - Character and Design

DPB2 - Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets

DPB3 - Conservation Areas

DPT4 - Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure

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)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2026 is a material consideration.

DP3, DP4, HE4, HE5 and HE9.

Other Legislation

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 72(1) - Special attention to be paid to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

ASSESSMENT

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

- Impact on Character and Appearance, Including Heritage Assets

- Impact on Neighbouring Amenities
- Highways Impact
- Flood Risk and Drainage
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Impact on Character and Appearance, Including Heritage Assets

In terms of the impact on the Hurstpierpoint Conservation Area, policy DP35 of the District Plan states:

"Development in a conservation area will be required to conserve or enhance its special character, appearance and the range of activities which contribute to it. This will be achieved by ensuring that:

- o New buildings and extensions are sensitively designed to reflect the special characteristics of the area in terms of their scale, density, design and through the use of complementary materials;*
- o Open spaces, gardens, landscaping and boundary features that contribute to the special character of the area are protected. Any new landscaping or boundary features are designed to reflect that character;*
- o Traditional shop fronts that are a key feature of the conservation area are protected. Any alterations to shopfronts in a conservation area will only be permitted where they do not result in the loss of a traditional shopfront and the new design is sympathetic to the character of the existing building and street scene in which it is located;*
- o Existing buildings that contribute to the character of the conservation area are protected. Where demolition is permitted, the replacement buildings are of a design that reflects the special characteristics of the area;*
- o Activities such as markets, crafts or other activities which contribute to the special character and appearance of the conservation area are supported;*
- o New pavements, roads and other surfaces reflect the materials and scale of the existing streets and surfaces in the conservation area.*

Development will also protect the setting of the conservation area and in particular views into and out of the area.

New buildings of outstanding or innovative design may be acceptable in conservation areas provided that their impact would not cause material harm to the area."

DP26 of the 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 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'*

HE5 and HE6 of the NPPF states that:

'HE5 1 Development proposals affecting heritage assets should be accompanied by an assessment of the significance of the assets affected (including any contribution made by their setting) and of the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is necessary to understand the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The relevant historic environment record should be referred to in making this assessment, and appropriate expertise employed where necessary.

2 Assessments of the potential effects of development proposals on the significance of heritage assets (including through effects on their setting) should identify whether proposals would be likely to:

- a. Have a positive effect, which is where the significance of a heritage asset would be enhanced, or better revealed; or*
- b. Have no effect on the significance of a heritage asset; or*
- c. Result in harm to the significance of a heritage asset, either from work affecting the asset itself or from development within its setting. The degree of harm should be identified: substantial harm would occur where the development proposal would seriously affect a key element of the asset's significance; or*
- d. Cause the total loss of the significance of a heritage asset.*

3 In making this assessment it is the effect on a heritage asset's significance rather than the scale of the development which should be considered.

4 Decision-makers should be satisfied that assessments accurately reflect the effects on heritage assets caused by development proposals.

5 Where a development proposal involves, or has the potential to involve, a heritage asset with archaeological interest, an appropriate desk-based assessment should be undertaken and, where necessary, a field evaluation. These should be used to help understand the asset's significance and the potential effect of the proposal on this, which should inform the design, mitigation and implementation of the development.

HE6 1 When considering the potential effect of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential effect amounts to a positive effect, harm, substantial harm, or total loss of its significance.

Development proposals which would have a positive effect on a designated heritage asset should be supported.

Any harm to a designated heritage asset will be a matter of considerable importance and weight, which should be dealt with in accordance with paragraphs 4 to 6 of this policy.

Where a development proposal would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal. Important public benefits can include securing the long-term reuse of a vacant or underused listed building, and enabling energy efficiency and low carbon heating measures to be employed.

Where a development proposal would cause substantial harm to, or the total loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, consent should be refused unless it can be demonstrated that the harm is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh the harm or loss, or if all of the following apply:

- a. The nature of the heritage asset would otherwise prevent all reasonable uses of the site;*
- b. No suitable use for the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation;*
- c. Conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is not possible; and*
- d. The harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the asset back into use.'*

HE9 of the NPPF states:

'Development proposals within or affecting the significance of conservation areas should:

- a. Retain and conserve buildings and other features which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area where possible; and*
- b. Consider the area's special architectural or historic interest (as identified as part of the designation of the conservation area) in the design of development.'*

Not all elements of a conservation area will necessarily contribute to its significance. Where a development proposal would result in the loss of a building or other element which contributes to the

character or appearance of a conservation area that is desirable to conserve, the assessment of impact should take into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the conservation area as a whole, and the effects of this considered in accordance with policies HE5 and HE6.'

Principle DG49 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide states:

'Extensions should typically use simple, uncomplicated building forms to compliment and coordinate with the scale, form and massing of the original dwelling. The design approach may benefit from coordinating with the existing pattern of window and door openings as well as employing facing materials to match those of the existing dwelling. Otherwise, it should demonstrate the appropriateness of the alternative approach.'

In terms of rear extensions, principle DG51 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 below assessment is made whilst being mindful of this guidance and having regard to the statutory duty of the Council, as the Local Planning Authority, to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

The Council's Conservation Officer has provided their comments in response to the development proposal with the full comments viewable on the applications case file.

It was noted within their response that the proposed single storey rear infill extension and pergola would be lightweight structures and would be of a limited overall size and scale.

Furthermore, the replacement of the existing timber sash windows to the principal elevation with the same material and incorporation of slim-line glazing would not be contentious. The replacement of existing uPVC windows elsewhere was only considered to be acceptable due to their existing use and therefore not introducing an otherwise unsympathetic material to the palette. To the roof slope, the replacement of the concrete roof tiles with slate was considered to help reinstate a more sympathetic material. The rear light tunnels visual impact was considered to have a minor visual impact and therefore was not deemed as being contentious.

In terms of the existing greenhouses' demolition, this was not considered to possess any particular historic interest and the proposed car port in its place was considered to be similar in scale to neighbouring buildings. Given that there is a degree of variance between rear outbuildings along the terrace, the use of a hit and miss timber construction was considered to be acceptable.

The Conservation Officer therefore concluded that the works would be acceptable in terms of their impact on the character and appearance of the area and the Conservation Area. The Conservation Officer's comments throughout are agreed with by the Case Officer. It is therefore considered that a neutral impact would be generated by the development in terms of its impact on the Conservation Area.

A number of pre-commencement conditions were recommended by the Conservation Officer which would require details of the following; facing and roofing materials to the main house, details and sections of new rear windows, external doors and eaves details to the extension. A further compliance condition was noted which would require the rainwater goods to be of painted metal. These conditions are considered to be relevant and necessary should permission be granted.

Details of soft landscaping around the ASHP was suggested as a condition by the Conservation Officer, however the imposition of such a condition is not considered to be necessary given the units discrete position with regard to the public domain.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to result in a neutral impact on the Conservation Area and would preserve the setting of the nearby listed buildings. The proposal would therefore meet the provisions of DP26, DP34 and DP35 of the District Plan and the policies within the NPPF.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenities

In terms of impact upon neighbouring amenities, Policy DP26 in part seeks to ensure that development:

'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 DP29);'

Principle DG47 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD relates to neighbouring amenities in terms of light and states:

'All dwellings should benefit from daylight and sunlight levels that conform to BRE (Better Regulation Executive) standards.'

DP29 then relates in part to noise:

The environment, including nationally designated environmental sites, nationally protected landscapes, areas of nature conservation or geological interest, wildlife habitats, and the quality of people's life will be protected from unacceptable levels of noise, light and air pollution by only permitting development where:

Noise pollution:

o It is designed, located and controlled to minimise the impact of noise on health and quality of life, neighbouring properties and the surrounding area;

o If it is likely to generate significant levels of noise it incorporates appropriate noise attenuation measures;

Noise sensitive development, such as residential, will not be permitted in close proximity to existing or proposed development generating high levels of noise unless adequate sound insulation measures, as supported by a noise assessment are incorporated within the development.

In appropriate circumstances, the applicant will be required to provide:

o an assessment of the impact of noise generated by a proposed development; or

o an assessment of the effect of noise by an existing noise source upon a proposed development;

The proposed pergola would be positioned within a close proximity to the shared boundary with the adjoining property to the west at No.138. It is considered that the pergola would be of a marginally greater footprint than that of the existing lean to and would remain of a single storey size and scale. It is therefore considered that the proposal pergola would not give rise to a significant overbearing impact.

Furthermore, the proposed car port to the rear of the garden would be set at a slightly higher finished floor level than the rest of the proposed development. This would be positioned within a close proximity to the neighbouring side boundaries to both the east and west. It is considered that the carport would be limited in its overall height and would be positioned a significant distance from any neighbouring habitable accommodation. Whilst the structure would be located nearby the neighbouring gardens, it is not considered that an undue overbearing impact would be incurred.

A new ASHP would be set to the northern elevation of the carport and would therefore be located at a significant distance in excess of 10m away from the neighbouring dwellings to the north. It is therefore considered that this distance would be sufficient to overcome significant noise nuisance generated towards neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed new windows at ground and first floor level to the side (east) elevation of the projecting gable would largely reflect the current level of outlook offered by the existing windows.

Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to result in an acceptable impact with regard to neighbouring amenities. The proposal would therefore meet the provisions of DP26 of the District Plan.

Highways Impact

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe. Additionally, Policy DP21 of the District Plan requires development proposals to protect the safety of road users and pedestrians.

The proposed development would not increase the quantum of bedrooms and would still have a total of three bedrooms. As such, the proposal would not trigger the requirement to provide additional parking spaces in line with the West Sussex County Council Parking Provision Guidance. The car port would however improve the on site car parking provision from the existing arrangement.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to comply with the provisions of DP21 of the District Plan.

Flood Risk and Drainage

Policy DP41 of the District Plan notes that:

'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 application site is located within flood zone 1 with Environment Agency mapping indicating that 1 in 100 year and climate change flood events could affect part of the site in terms of surface water flooding. The submitted Flood Risk Assessment suggests some mitigation measures to combat the surface water flood risk, including rear doors and low permeability materials to be positioned 600mm above floor level, finished floor level no lower than the existing and permeable surfacing to the proposed patio area. In response to this information, the Council's Drainage Engineer recommended that the application be approved.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would result in an acceptable impact in terms of its flood risk and drainage impact and would comply with DP41 of the District Plan.

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 is appropriate in terms of design and will not negatively impact on the host dwelling nor its immediate Conservation Area setting, will not harm neighbouring amenities, result in an acceptable highways impact and flood risk and drainage.

The proposal will comply with Policies DP21, DP26, DP29, DP35 and DP41 of the District Plan, the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan, the MSDC Design Guide and the requirements of the NPPF.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Stefan Galyas

