

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/1475	Case Officer:	Deborah Lynn
Application Type:	Full Application		
Proposal:	Demolition of existing external concrete staircase. Erection of replacement external metal staircase and balcony above existing rear single storey extension. Minor alteration to rear hipped roof of extension to remove valley.		
Site:	Upper Woodside, 29 Crescent Road, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 1HR, , ,		
Validation Date	13 Aug 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	3 Sep 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	24 Sep 2026
Target Date:	8 Oct 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Deborah Lynn

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Steven King	Date:	24 Sep 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/1475

**Upper Woodside, 29 Crescent Road, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 1HR, ,
Demolition of existing external concrete staircase. Erection of replacement external metal
staircase and balcony above existing rear single storey extension. Minor alteration to rear
hipped roof of extension to remove valley.**

Mr Rod Fox

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Not applicable.

EAST GRINSTEAD TOWN COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No comment.

INTRODUCTION

This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of an existing external concrete staircase and the erection of a replacement metal staircase and balcony above a single storey rear extension. A minor alteration to the rear hipped roof of extension to remove valley is also proposed.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

GR/044/94 - Balcony over existing single storey projection to rear of property. Permission granted 07.04.1994.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

No 29 Crescent Road is a first and second floor flat located in a former detached dwellinghouse now comprised of 2 flats known as no. 29 (Upper Woodside) and no. 31 (Woodside). The building lies within a residential street, primarily comprised of period properties. The flat at no. 29 is accessed via an external concrete staircase located to the rear of the building.

A dismantled railway line, now heavily wooded, lies to the rear of the property.

In terms of planning policy, the site lies within the built up area of East Grinstead.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Plans show that the existing external concrete staircase will be removed due to its dilapidated state and replaced with a metal staircase of similar dimensions. The staircase is shown to measure 4.5 metres in length by 1.29 metres wide and 3 metres high and will be served by 0.9 metre high handrails on each side.

A metal framed balcony is also proposed to the southern side of the staircase above a ground floor extension serving no. 31. The raised platform is shown to measure approximately 3 metres high by 2.4 metres wide and 2.5 metres deep. The balcony will be enclosed by a 1.1 metre high metal balustrade to the rear with a 1.7 metre high timber slatted screen proposed to its southern side.

The application also proposes to remove a roof hip valley to an existing ground floor extension, with the roof slope instead proposed to continue back to the external rear wall of the dwellinghouse.

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 East Grinstead 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.

East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan

The Neighbourhood Plan was made on the 2nd November 2016.

Relevant policies:

EG3 promoting good 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:

DPS6 health and wellbeing

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)

Policy S3 of the NPPF concerns the presumption in favour of sustainable development and advises that policy S4 in this Framework should be applied when considering development proposals within settlements.

Policy S4 states in part that *'development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework.'*

ASSESSMENT

The main issues deemed relevant to the consideration of this application are:

- Design and impact on character of area
- Impact on neighbouring amenities

Design and impact on character of area

Policy DP26 of the District Plan relates to character and design and requires all proposals to be well designed while addressing the character and scale of surrounding buildings and landscape. Policy EG3 of the Neighbourhood Plan requires proposals to be proportionate and in keeping with the scale, height and materials of the surrounding area amongst other criteria

However, the policies carry very limited weight as they are materially inconsistent with the NPPF, with more weight given to NPPF policy DP3.

Policy DP3 of the NPPF sets out the key principles for well-designed places. This sets out in part that proposals should respond to their context, so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features, and the restoration, reuse and integration of heritage assets.

The proposed metal staircase is similar in size and scale to the existing concrete staircase and is considered an improvement in design terms, appearing more lightweight and being constructed from a more appropriate material for the period property. The proposed balcony area to the side would also have a lightweight appearance and is considered appropriate in terms of form, size and scale.

The proposed works to the roof of the existing rear extension are minimal and are not considered to detract from the appearance of the building.

As the proposed works are sited to the rear of the building, the proposal is considered to have very limited visual impact within the locality, being well screened in views from the public realm.

As such, the proposed development is not considered to detract from the character and appearance of the area, thereby acceding with policies DP26 of the District Plan and EG3 of the Neighbourhood Plan and NPPF policy DP3.

Impact on amenity

Policy DP26 of the District Plan refers to amenity and states that development 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'. Neighbourhood Plan policy EG3 states in part that proposals should not harm adjoining amenity.

Very limited weight however can be given to these policies which are considered materially inconsistent with the NPPF; more weight is therefore given to NPPF policies L2 and P3.

Policy L2 of the NPPF relates to making effective use of land. Part L2: 1.d. ii requires proposals to have *'acceptable living standards for residents and neighbours in terms of access to daylight, sunlight, privacy and external amenity space.'*

Policy P3 of the NPPF relates to living conditions and pollution. Part P3: 2.b of this policy requires proposals to *'not give rise to, or contribute to, an unacceptable level of access to daylight and sunlight for neighbouring residents and occupiers, or unacceptable levels of air, noise, artificial light, water, soil or other forms of pollution on or beyond the site'.*

The proposed balcony would immediately adjoin the rear garden to Woodside, with potential to also overlook onto neighbouring properties at no's 27 and 33.

Plans show that a 1.7 metre high slatted timber screen would be installed on the southern side of the balcony, which should assist in preventing undue overlooking onto adjoining properties. A condition can be imposed to ensure that this is retained in perpetuity to protect neighbouring amenities.

The northern boundary of the property with no. 33 Crescent Road is overgrown with established vegetation that assists in screening the rear garden at no. 33 in views from Upper Woodside. However, it is acknowledged that the vegetation could be removed or lost at some future point. There is a degree of overlooking from the existing concrete staircase onto the neighbouring garden area at no. 33 and consequently it is not considered that the proposed balcony area would be likely to have an unacceptable impact in terms of creating additional overlooking onto no. 33. As such, it is not considered necessary to impose that screening is installed to the northern elevation of the staircase and balcony.

Given the size of the proposed balcony area, nor is it considered that the proposal would be detrimental to neighbouring amenities in terms of creating additional noise and disturbance.

In view of the above, the proposed development is deemed acceptable in that it should allow acceptable living standards to be retained for neighbouring residents in terms of privacy and should not result in acceptable levels of noise and disturbance.

The proposal therefore accords with policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policy EG3 of the Neighbourhood Plan and policies L2 and P3 of the NPPF.

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 proposed development is deemed acceptable in terms of design, form and scale to the existing building and surrounding properties and is not considered to detract from the character and appearance of the area. Nor should the proposal cause unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenities in terms of reducing privacy or creating additional noise and disturbance. The proposal therefore accords with policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policy EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan and policies DP3, L2 and P3 of the NPPF.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Deborah Lynn