

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/0133	Case Officer:	Andrew Horrell
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Side and rear double storey extension with single storey rear extension		
Site:	54 St Peters Road, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 8JL, , , ,		
Validation Date	23 Jan 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	9 Apr 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	13 Apr 2026
Target Date:	20 Mar 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Andrew Horrell

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	2
--	--	-------------------------------	---

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

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/0133

**54 St Peters Road, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 8JL, , ,
Side and rear double storey extension with single storey rear extension
Mr And Mrs Hope**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

Comments have been received from 32 Park Road and 56 St Peters Road who have commented on the below grounds:

- Flood Risk and Drainage
- How mutual boundary fencing is to be maintained

CONSULTEE COMMENTS

MSDC Conservation Officer: The application site is an unlisted, semi-detached house dating from the second half of the 20th century. It is located within the setting of the St Johns Conservation Area, the boundary of which runs along the southern side of the rear garden to the property.

The development along St Peters Road could perhaps be said to have some broad similarity in terms of the date of construction, but no particular consistency of style. Many of the properties have been altered or extended, including the attached neighbour to no. 54. In my opinion, the site, common with St Peters Road in general, makes at best a neutral contribution to the setting of the Conservation Area.

The proposal is for fairly substantial additions to the side and rear of the house, over part one and part two storeys. However, given the existing extensions to no. 56, the fairly mixed context of development along St Peters Road, and the generally sympathetic appearance of the proposal, scale aside, I do not think that an objection in terms of adverse impact on the setting of the Conservation Area could be sustained.

The proposal is therefore considered to meet the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Southern Water: No objections

TOWN COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Comments: The Committee would Recommend Refusal as it was felt the application contravenes:
Mid Sussex District Plan

DP26 - Character and Design due to being out of character for the local area.

Mid Sussex Design Guide

DG49 - General Principles for Extensions - as wraparound extensions can undermine the integrity of the original architecture.

Concern was expressed about access to bins as there will no longer be a side access.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey side/rear extension and a single storey rear extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None relevant

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

54 St Peters Road is a two-storey semi-detached hipped roofed dwelling with a front gable. The walls are painted pebbledash with upvc doors and windows.

To the north of the site is the driveway to the highway beyond, to the south of the site is the rear garden with close boarded fencing and hedging to neighbours in Park Road beyond, to the west of the site is the adjoining No.56 and to the east of the site is hedging to set back No.52 beyond.

The site is within the built-up area of Burgess Hill and is adjacent to St Johns Conservation Area.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposed two storey side/rear extension approximately measures 9.6m in maximum depth, 6.7m in maximum width with a height to eaves of 4.9m and an overall height of 7.35m. This serves a utility room and integral garage on ground floor and a bedroom and bathroom on 1st floor with a side rooflight.

The proposed single storey rear extension measures 4m in depth, 8.153m in width with an approximate height to eaves of 2.5m and an overall height of 3.3m, The extension is characterised by three rooflights. This serves a kitchen/dining 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 Burgess Hill 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 (Design and Character)
DP35 (Conservation Area)

WSCC Guidance on Parking at New Developments - September 2020

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.

Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan

Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan was formally 'made' as of 28th January 2016.

Relevant policies include:

H1 - Protecting and Enhancing Heritage Assets and Conservation Areas
S4 - Parking Standards

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 hearings were concluded on the 19th March 2026. 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:

DPB1 - Character and Design
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) (December 2024)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 is a material consideration. Paragraphs 8, 11, 131, 135, 212- 215

ASSESSMENT

Design and Character

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'*

The Mid Sussex Design Guide is also considered to be relevant and principle DG49 states that:

'Extensions should respond to the design of the original dwelling and applicants will be expected to demonstrate how local character has informed the design proposal. Extensions should also normally be designed to be well-integrated with the existing scale, form and massing allowing the original building to remain the dominant element of the property whether it has one or several additions'.

Principle DG50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide relates specifically to side extensions and states:

'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 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD relates specifically to rear extensions states the following:

'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 adjoining No.56 is characterised by a single storey rear extension (07/01592/FUL) and a two storey side/rear extension characterises No.58 (08/0466/FUL).

It is considered that the proposed wrap around side and rear extension would be set within a visually discrete position with regard to the street scene.

It will be a modest widening of the existing dwelling and therefore is deemed to be of form in character with the existing dwelling. It is subservient to the existing dwelling and will use visually similar materials to the existing dwelling.

The proposed single storey rear extension is similar in size to the adjoining neighbour No.56.

The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy DP26 of the District Plan and the relevant principles of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.

Impact on the setting of the Conservation Area

The site lies adjacent to the St Johns Conservation Area.

Policy DP35 of the District Plan relates to Conservation Area. In part this states:

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

The NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Paras 212 - 215 of the NPPF states:

'212. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great 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 harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance

213. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;*
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.*

214. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

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

215. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use'.

The Conservation Officer considers that the application properly makes a neutral impact to the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area and in terms of the proposal an objection on the basis of an adverse impact on the setting of the Conservation Area could not be sustained. Therefore it is considered to meet the requirements of District Plan Policy DP35 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

The Planning Officer agrees with the Conservation Officer that the proposal is considered to conserve the setting of the St Johns Conservation Area.

The proposal thereby complies with Policy DP35 of the District Plan, H1 of the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Parking Standards

With the creation of a new bedroom, parking standards have to be assessed.

West Sussex County Council August 2019 Parking Standards Guidance outlines that for a 4-bedroom dwelling in this location that 2.2 parking spaces has to be provided. While the standards set out within S4 of the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan requires a 4-bedroom dwellinghouse to have 2 designated spaces and 1 non-designated space per 2 dwellings.

With the closing up of the gap to the east of the dwelling, only one car can be parked within the driveway as the proposed integral garage measures an insufficient size to serve as parking space. However, it is noted that the road has no parking restrictions and is within a locality with alternative forms of transportation (buses and train) within walking distance.

Therefore, despite the shortfall, the proposed is deemed to comply with policy DP21 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policy S4 of the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan and the WSCC Parking Standards Guidance.

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 Policy DP29);'

Given the extended nature of No.56, the impact of the proposed rear extension in terms of light and outlook is not considered significantly harmful.

In terms of overlooking and privacy, whilst there will be an additional first floor rear window, this will be no more harmful than the existing first floor rear windows.

The neighbour has raised concern as to how the mutual boundary and respective rear extensions are to be maintained given the close proximity when both are extended. This is in part a private matter and it should be noted that a rear extension can be installed within a dwellings curtilage up to the mutual boundary without the need for planning permission.

Therefore, in terms of neighbouring amenities, the proposal complies with DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Other

In terms of flood risk, the application site is within a low surface water flood risk locality and therefore drainage works will be dealt with at the building control stage of the build.

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

Planning legislation requires the application to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It is therefore necessary for the planning application to be assessed against the policies in the development plan and then to take account of other material planning considerations including the NPPF.

The proposed alterations are considered to be sensitive to the existing design of the dwelling, the wider streetscene and the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area, will not cause detriment to the amenities of the neighbouring properties and is deemed to be a sustainable transport locality despite the shortfall in parking provision. The application therefore complies with Policies DP21, DP26 and DP35 of the District Plan, policies H1 and S4 of the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan, the adopted Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD as well as the requirements of the NPPF.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Andrew Horrell