

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/2831	Case Officer:	Peter Davies
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Single storey front and rear extensions. Part garage conversion with extend link between dwelling and garage. Front storm porch.		
Site:	8 Elger Way, Copthorne, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 3JJ, , ,		
Validation Date	4 Nov 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	28 Nov 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	14 Jan 2026
Target Date:	30 Dec 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	Peter Davies

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	14 Jan 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/2831

**8 Elger Way, Copthorne, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 3JJ, ,
Single storey front and rear extensions. Part garage conversion with extend link between
dwelling and garage. Front storm porch.
Mr And Mrs Sheehan**

REPRESENTATION RECEIVED

None received.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Defer to officer.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for a proposed single storey front and side extension, rear extension, front porch, partial garage conversion and extension to the link between dwelling and garage.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

No relevant history.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application property is a detached bungalow located on the north side of the cul-de-sac Elger Way, within the built-up area boundary of Copthorne.

The application property has a hipped roof and is constructed from brick with interlocking roof tiles and white uPVC fenestration. The dwelling has a garage to the east side that is connected to the main dwelling by a uPVC link. To the front of the property is a large front garden. To the rear of the property is the rear garden with woodland and the countryside beyond. the locality is characterised by detached bungalows of a similar form and design however some have been extended in the past.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The application seeks planning permission for a front and side extension rear extension, front porch, partial garage conversion and extension to the link between dwelling and garage.

The proposed front and side extension will replace an existing conservatory and have a width a depth of 5.50 metres and 6.50 metres. The extension will have a hipped roof with an eaves height of 2.55 metres and a ridge height of 3.90 metres to match the existing dwelling. The extension will be constructed from brick and tiles to match the existing dwelling and grey fenestration. The extension will have two bedrooms and an ensuite bathroom.

The rear extension will have a width and depth of 1.85 metres and 3.40 metres joining onto the side of an existing rear protrusion. The extension will have a flat roof with a height of 2.85 metres and be constructed from brick to match the existing dwelling with a felt roof.

The proposed front porch extends forward approximately 0.70 metres with a pitched roof canopy extending a further 1.0 metre. The porch will have width of 1.8 metres and be constructed from brick and tiles to match the existing dwelling with grey fenestration. The existing uPVC link between the dwelling

and garage is to be replaced with a brick extension of the same footprint. 0.75 metres of the rear of the garage is to be converted into a utility room with the store area at the back of the garage.

Existing windows on the rear elevation are to be replaced with grey bi fold doors.

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:

DP21 - Transport
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 (made September 2021)

Relevant policies:

CNP1 - General Development Requirements
CNP15 - Car parking

Other Material Considerations

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 (Regulation 19) is currently at Examination and 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:

DPS2 - Sustainable Design and Construction
DPB1 - Character and Design
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) (December 2024)

Paragraphs 8, 11, 131 and 135 are considered to be relevant.

National Planning Policy Guidance

Ministerial Statement and Design Guide

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
- Impact on neighbouring properties
- Impact on parking provision
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Design and Character

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex 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;*
- *protects valued townscapes and the separate identity and character of towns and villages;*
- *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 Policy DP27);*
- *creates a pedestrian-friendly layout that is safe, well connected, legible and accessible;*
- *incorporates well integrated parking that does not dominate the street environment, particularly where high density housing is proposed;*
- *positively addresses sustainability considerations in the layout and the building design;*
- *take the opportunity to encourage community interaction by creating layouts with a strong neighbourhood focus/centre; larger (300+ unit) schemes will also normally be expected to incorporate a mixed use element;*
- *optimises the potential of the site to accommodate development."*

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.

CNP1.2

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.

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.'*

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 in part states that:

'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.'

Principle DG51 relates to rear extensions and states that:

'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 proposed front and side extension is large in scale however is of an appropriate design in keeping to the dwelling. Additionally, the dwelling is set well back from the highway and to be constructed from materials to be similar in appearance to the existing dwelling. Other bungalows have had front extensions including no. 2 Elger Way, in application DM/18/1890, resulting in the bungalows not having a uniform appearance.

The proposed rear extension is acceptable in scale, form and design. The extension will not be visible from the public realm and will be constructed from materials similar in appearance to the existing dwelling.

The proposed partial garage conversion and link will replace the existing uPVC link between the garage and dwelling and will be constructed from brick and be more appropriate to the character of the area. The porch will be located to the front of the link and be of an acceptable design and scale to the character of the dwelling.

The proposal therefore considered to comply with policy DP26 of the District Plan and CNP1 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan.

Impact on neighbouring properties

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 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.

The proposed front and side extension is approximately 2.5 metres to the shared boundary with no. 9 Elger Way marked by close board fencing. The extension is single storey and of modest height. The extension will have a side facing window facing the fence however this is replacing a glazed conservatory and therefore not creating unacceptable harm in terms of overlooking amenity area. The extension will also have views facing the front garden and the street scene.

The proposed rear extension is a small addition with an existing rear protrusion being in between the proposed extension and the shared boundary of no. 9. The extension is single storey and approximately 8.0 metres from the shared boundary with no. 7 Elger Way.

The proposed porch is small in scale set within the application property overlooking the front garden and street scene and will therefore not cause unacceptable harm to neighbour amenities.

The proposed partial garage conversion and link will not increase the footprint of the dwelling and the garage externally will remain unchanged on the side of no. 7. The link will be increased in height to the existing uPVC however will be located between the dwelling and garage and will therefore not result in unacceptable harm to neighbour amenities in terms of overlooking or loss of light.

Therefore, in terms of neighbouring amenities, the proposal is deemed to not cause unacceptable harm and therefore complies with DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and CNP1.2 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan.

Impact on Parking Provision

Policy DP21 in part states:

'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;'

Policy CNP15 of the Neighbourhood Plan relates to car parking and states:

'CNP15.1 Developments within the defined Built up Area Boundary which would involve the loss of off-road parking spaces on a site will only be supported where alternative provision is made in accordance with CNP15.3.

CNP15.2 Insofar as planning permission is required development proposals which would result in the loss of parking spaces within an existing garage should provide replacement parking provision in accordance with Policy 15.3

CNP15.3 New development should include car parking spaces in accordance with the greater of:

a) The latest WSCC guidance at the time the application is submitted. OR

b) For residential units, provision of on-plot / off-street car parking spaces in accordance with the following table:

<i>Number of Bedrooms</i>	<i>Number of parking spaces</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>3</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>4+</i>	<i>4</i>

West Sussex County Council September 2020 Parking Standards Guidance, outlines that for a 4 bed dwelling in parking behaviour zone 2, 2.7 spaces should be provided. The dwelling has parking for 3 cars on the drive and 1 space in the garage. Policy CNP15 requires a 4 bedroom dwelling to have 4 spaces.

The 3 spaces on the drive would be retained and therefore would provide sufficient parking space that meets the parking requirements set out within the WSCC Guidance. The proposal would not meet the requirement to meet CNP15 however there are no on street parking restrictions and the WSCC parking guidance has been met and is considered acceptable. The proposal is therefore, considered to comply with Policy DP21 of the Mid Sussex 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 considered to be acceptable in terms of design, size and scale to the dwellinghouse and locality, would not cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties. Therefore, the proposal complies with Mid Sussex District Plan policies DP21 and DP26, policy CNP1 and CNP15 of the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan and with the relevant provisions of the NPPF. The application therefore accords with the Development Plan and is considered acceptable.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Peter Davies