

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/0803	Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed extensions and alterations		
Site:	135 College Lane, Hurstpierpoint, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9AF, , ,		
Validation Date	28 Mar 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	23 Apr 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	19 May 2025
Target Date:	23 May 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Stefan Galyas</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	20 May 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/0803

**135 College Lane, Hurstpierpoint, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9AF, ,
Proposed extensions and alterations
Mr C Martyr**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

There was one letter of representation received in response to the proposed development. The letter sought to support the development proposal and commented that the proposed design was of an acceptable appearance.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Naturespace District Licensing: *It is considered that the proposed development is unlikely to have an impact great crested newts and/or their habitats.*

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Parish Council: The committee's recommendation is that MSDC should give permission. The committee noted that the design is an improvement and supports the changes from the previous application.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for the development of a rear elevation two and single storey extension, a front porch as well as a two-storey side extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/24/3125 - Proposed two storey side and rear extension and alterations. Withdrawn 26.02.25

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application relates to no.135 College Lane, a detached two storey property with a hipped roof and set to the eastern side of the highway. The existing dwelling is set back from the highway edge by an existing front driveway space with a front mature hedge acting as the front boundary treatment. To the rear of the dwelling, there is an existing pebble dash exterior single storey outbuilding as well as a single storey timber built outbuilding which follows an 'L' shaped form. The dwelling is afforded ample garden amenity space to the rear which stretches back in a linear plot format. The existing dwelling is composed of brick exterior walls with some pebble dashing at first floor level, a tiled roof and white uPVC windows.

There are a number of other detached and semi-detached residential dwellings within the sites locality which front both sides of the road. A number of different properties appear to have been modernised and extended over time.

With regard to policy constraints, the site is located within the Hurstpierpoint built up area.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposal would develop a two-storey rear extension which would measure at approximately 3.3m in length, 5.7m wide, have an eaves height of 4.7m and a ridge height of 6.6m.

In terms of the proposed rear elevation single storey extension, this would measure at circa 6.5m in length, 9.3m wide and 3m high.

The proposed two storey side extension would measure at 9m in length, 3.3m wide, have an eaves height of 4.8m and a ridge height of 8m.

The proposed front porch would measure at circa 1.3m in depth, 2.8m wide, have an eaves height of 2.4m and a ridge height of 3.5m.

Proposed external materials throughout would include brick, render and oak cladding to the exterior walls, plain roof tiles as well as white and anthracite uPVC windows.

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:

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.

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 (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:

DPS1 - Climate Change

DPS2 - Sustainable Design and Construction

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 2, 8, 11, 39, 48, 115-117, 131, 135 & 139.

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 Amenities
- Biodiversity Net Gain

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:

- 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'*

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 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide elaborates further on what constitutes 'good design' in relation to side extensions:

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.

Additionally, Principle DG50 as set out within the Design Guide, relates to front extensions:

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.

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'

It is considered that the sites immediate locality is characterised by regular gaps between dwellings within the street scene. This sets a regular pattern to the development and allows each dwelling to be clearly read as separate and offset from the neighbours.

The proposed development would extend out towards the side (northern) elevation and thus develop within the gap between the application property and the neighbour to the north at no.137. It is considered that the side extension has been reduced in width from the previously withdrawn proposal and the gap towards the neighbouring property would likely still be legible. As such, it is not considered that the proposed development would enclose an important gap within the streetscene.

The existing roof form would adjoin the proposed two storey side extension and would continue the existing hipped roof format with a matching eaves height. The continuation of the existing hipped roof design is considered to help the side extension assimilate towards the existing. Furthermore, it is considered that the use of a single storey lean to design along the side extension would help break up the overall perceived bulk and scale of this element.

A crown roof design would be used to the proposed two storey rear extension and the maximum height would be significantly offset from the ridge height of the host dwelling whilst the eaves would be matched. It is considered that this offset in maximum height would ensure that the extension is read as a later addition to the dwelling and improve its overall subservience, despite its two storey scale.

With regard to the proposed single storey rear extension, this is considered to utilise more contemporary materials such as rendered walls and a zinc frame. The single storey extension would likely appear subservient towards the existing dwelling by virtue of its limited size and scale.

The proposed front porch would be of a light and subservient appearance towards the main dwelling and would use an outer beamed frame. The pitch above the doorway would help signify the main point of entry to the dwelling and it is considered that the porch would not appear overly incongruous within its immediate context.

Throughout the existing and proposed dwelling to the principal elevation, a plain oak cladding would be used which is considered to materially alter the existing dwellings appearance. Given the limited architectural significance of the existing brickwork and pebble dash, such an alteration is considered to be acceptable.

In summary, the proposal is considered that the proposal would comply with the provisions of DP26 of the District Plan and the relevant principles of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.

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.'

The two storey extension would project by approximately 3.3m from the existing rear elevation and the proposed single storey rear extension would project by 6.5m in length. Principle DG47 of the Design Guide states among other matters that all dwellings should benefit from daylight and sunlight levels that conform to BRE (Better Regulation Executive) standards. Further guidance is set out within the "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice" document. The "25 degree approach" should be taken whereby a 25 degree line is drawn from the centre of the lowest opposite habitable room. If the neighbouring properties window lies beneath the 25 degrees as measured, then the building will not likely cause a significant reduction in light received to the concerned window. This guidance is taken as a rule of thumb and each planning application is assessed based on its own merits.

Both neighbouring properties are offset from the shared site boundary and when measured from the adjacent facing windows, the rear extension would pass with the line largely following the proposed two storey roof slope. When the 25 degree test is applied with regard to the proposed two storey side extension from the side (south) facing windows at no.137, the test would likely be breached. Nevertheless, these side facing windows serve a kitchen and a secondary living room window. The existing conservatory to the rear at the neighbouring site would still retain sufficient light through the extensive glazing used throughout. As such, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in a significant overbearing impact.

The side (southern) elevation window arrangement would remain the same as the existing, however, a new window would be added to the other side (northern) elevation which would serve a bathroom. As this is a non-habitable room and is shown to utilise an obscure glazed finish on the submitted plans, it is not considered that a restrictive condition is necessary in this instance in the case that planning permission is granted.

To the rear elevation, a Juliet balcony would be added with a large window opening to serve bedroom one. This opening could allow for access out onto the proposed flat roof which would be created through the proposed single storey extension. As such, a condition restricting the flat roofs use as a balcony is considered relevant and necessary should permission be granted in the interest of protecting neighbouring amenities.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered to comply with the provisions of DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan in terms of neighbouring amenities.

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 setting, will not result in harm towards neighbouring amenities.

The proposal will comply with Policy DP26 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