

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/3093	Case Officer:	Andrew Horrell
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed single storey side and rear wrap around extension		
Site:	2 Borers Close, Copthorne, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 3XW, , ,		
Validation Date	2 Dec 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	26 Dec 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	26 Jan 2026
Target Date:	27 Jan 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Andrew Horrell

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	26 Jan 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/3093

**2 Borers Close, Copthorne, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 3XW, ,
Proposed single storey side and rear wrap around extension
Mr Adam Finch**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

A representation from neighbour No.3 has commented on the following grounds:

- Insufficient details provided meaning application should be deemed invalid
- Need for control of working hours and noise of development

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

None received

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Defer to Officer noting neighbours objection concerns

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought for a single storey side and rear wrap around extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/23/1708 - Proposed single storey front extension.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

No.2 Borers Close is a two storey hipped roofed semi-detached dwelling within a cul-de-sac off Borers Arm Road. The dwelling is characterised by a mix of timber and upvc doors and windows, face brickwork walls and a pitched roofed white rendered porch.

There is a slope from south to north with neighbouring no.3 Borers Close set higher than the application site and from east to west with the rear garden set higher than the dwelling.

To the south of the site is the adjoining no.1 (characterised by single storey rear extension and two storey rear extension), to the north of the site is the set higher no.3, to the west is the higher garden with close boarded fencing to neighbouring Merestede beyond and to the east is the front garden with hedging to parking area.

The site is within the built-up area of Copthorne.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposed single storey side extension approximately measures 5.4m in depth, 3.8m in width with a height to eaves of 2.5m and an overall height of 3.2m. This will serve a formal dining room

The proposed rear extension approximately measures 3m in depth, 11.2m in width with a height to eaves of 2.5m and an overall height of 3.2m. This will serve a kitchen/dining room and utility room.

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 Copthorne 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.

There are no relevant policies.

Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan

The Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan was formally made by the Council on 29th September 2021.

Relevant policies:

CNP1.1 - Design and Character

CNP1.2 - Neighbouring Amenities

CNP1.6 - Residential Extensions

CNP12 - CA5: Post War Copthorne

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 the stage 1 hearings were concluded on the 31st October 2024. There are unresolved objections to some of the Policies in the draft District Plan and as such, 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:

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)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 is a material consideration. Paragraphs 8, 11, 131 and 135 are considered to be relevant to this application.

ASSESSMENT

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:

- is of high quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace;*
- 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;*
- creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape;*
- protects open spaces, trees and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;*
- 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'*

Policy CNP1 of the Neighbourhood Plan states (in part):

'CNP1.1

Proposals will be supported where they sustain or reinforce the positive aspects that make up the individual character and distinctiveness of each Character Area, as defined on the Policies Map, in which they sit.

CNP1.6

Extensions to existing buildings will be supported provided they adhere to other policies in the development plan and:

- a) Are no higher than the existing building.*
- b) Do not conflict with traditional boundary treatment of an area.*
- c) Use materials which are compatible with materials of existing/surrounding buildings.'*

Policy CNP12 of the Neighbourhood Plan states (in part):

'CNP12.1

As appropriate to their scale and nature development proposals within the defined Character Area 5:

- should deliver high quality development which takes account of their immediate locality. In particular development proposals should sustain and where practicable reinforce the positive aspects of the character area and respond positively to the identified sensitivity to change matters included in sections 4.10 and 4.11 of the Copthorne Heritage and Character Assessment (May 2019).'*

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.'

Principle DG50 relates to front and side 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

Side extensions should normally be subservient to the original dwelling and typically be set-back from the front of the house to help define the original building.

The gaps between dwellings can sometimes positively contribute to articulating (for example, through the consistent rhythm of repeated houses) and adding interest in a street frontage or by providing views / visible connections to the surrounding countryside. Side extensions will therefore need to appropriately respond to the character of the street form and will not normally be accepted where they close an important gap and view.'

Design Guide Principle DG51 refers 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.'

Adjoining neighbour no.1 is characterised by a single storey rear extension and two storey side/rear extension from the 1970s and 1980s, no.6 is characterised by a two storey side extension (07/00657/FUL).

The proposed extensions and alterations would be of forms and designs which are in proportion and appropriate to the character of the existing dwelling. The extensions and alterations would be visible from the streetscene, however, given the varying design and forms of the surrounding dwellings it is considered that the proposal would be in keeping with the character of the area and would not have a negative impact on the character of the streetscene.

It is noted that painted render characterises the existing porch and surrounding dwellings. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the property or the locality.

The proposal therefore complies with policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policies CNP1 and CNP12 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan and principles DG49 and DG50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide.

Neighbouring Amenities

In terms of impact on neighbouring amenities, Policy DP26 of the District Plan states that it must be demonstrated that any 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.

Policy CNP1.2 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan states:

'Proposals for new development should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity (including general activity, access, noise, privacy, daylight, and sunlight) of existing and future occupants, both on site and nearby.'

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 CNP1.2 and CNP2.1 (c) of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan is considered to take precedence and therefore the test in this instance is whether the development causes unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenities as outlined above.

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'.

Given the extended nature of the adjoining neighbour no.1 Borers Close at the mutual boundary, the impact on light and outlook will not be harmed as the proposed rear extension is the same depth as the neighbouring enlargement. Given the set higher nature of no.3 Borers Close, the impact on light and outlook is not deemed unacceptably harmful.

Given the single storey nature of the proposal and the relationship with the neighbouring properties, in terms of overlooking and privacy, no more harm than would be expected within the built-up area is likely to be caused.

Concern about noise, has been raised by the neighbour at no.3, as a householder extension serving a kitchen/dining room the level of noise of the development once built would be no more than expected. Whilst, there will be an increased level of noise during the building works, this is a short term impact and not grounds to refuse the application. An informative outlining the hours of work required under the 1990 Environmental Protection Act will be added to any approval.

Therefore, unacceptable harm will not be caused. Therefore, in terms of neighbouring amenities, the proposal complies with policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and policy CNP1.2 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan.

Other

The neighbour at no.3 has commented that the plans should be seen as invalid as they do not show the distance between the proposal and the mutual boundary, the lack of ground levels and foundations shown on the submitted plans. These elements outlined are not required by the national and local requirements for householder applications and therefore the application is seen as valid.

They also suggest that a Construction Management Plan should be requested as a condition, Given the householder nature of the proposal this is seen as contrary to paragraph 57 of the NPPF which outline that conditions should only be imposed where necessary and reasonable, which this would not be.

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 deemed in character with the existing dwelling and the wider streetscene, and the harm on neighbouring amenities is not deemed unacceptable.

The proposal is considered to accord with Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policies CNP1.1, CN1.2, CNP1.6 and CNP12 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan, Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD and the requirements of the NPPF. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Andrew Horrell