

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/1304	Case Officer:	Catherine Cardin
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed single storey wrap around extension to rear and side		
Site:	1 Oakley Grove, Crawley Down, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 4UT, , ,		
Validation Date	16 Jun 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	8 Jul 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	23 Jul 2025
Target Date:	11 Aug 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Catherine Cardin</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	24 Jul 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/1304

**1 Oakley Grove, Crawley Down, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 4UT, ,
Proposed single storey wrap around extension to rear and side
Mr And Mrs Goddard**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

MSDC Tree officer

No objection.

SOUTHERN WATER

No objection.

NATURE SPACE

No objection.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Defer to Officer.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought for a proposed single storey wrap around extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/16/2893- Erection of 5 detached houses with garages and access. Permission.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1 Oakley Grove is a two-storey detached dwelling. It is constructed of red brick with white upvc windows and a plain tile roof. The property has hanging tiles to the first-floor elevation. The property benefits from off road parking to the front of the property and a garden to the rear and side.

The property lies within a modern housing estate within the built-up area boundary of Crawley Down. Neighbouring properties are located to the west, northwest and east. Highway is located to the north.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The application seeks to construct a single storey wrap around extension.

This would measure some 7.3 metres in width and some 14.7 metres in depth. This would have a crown roof with a maximum height of some 3.3 metres and a height to the eaves of some 2.6 metres. It is proposed to install a window on the side (western) elevation and glazed sliding doors on the side (western) and rear (southern) elevation. The extension would be finished in brickwork, roof tiles and windows to match the existing. It is proposed to use this extension as a conservatory.

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 Crawley Down 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

Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan made in 2016.

Relevant policies:

Policy CDNP04.1- Building Extensions.

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:

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.

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
- Neighbouring Amenities
- Impact on trees
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Design and Character

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan relates to design and character and 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 protects valued townscapes and the separate identity and character of towns and villages;*
- 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 (see Policy DP27);*
- o creates a pedestrian-friendly layout that is safe, well connected, legible and accessible;*
- o incorporates well integrated parking that does not dominate the street environment, particularly where high density housing is proposed;*
- o positively addresses sustainability considerations in the layout and the building design;*
- o 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;*
- o optimises the potential of the site to accommodate development."*

Principle DG49 of the MSDC Design Guide establishes design principles for extensions to dwellings and 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. Extensions should typically use simple, uncomplicated building forms to complement 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. Extensions should not result in a significant loss to the private amenity area of the dwelling.

Principle DG50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD relate to side extensions and states that:

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.

Policy CDNP04.1 of the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan relates to building extensions and states:

'Building extensions will be permitted provided they are in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan and meet the following criteria:

- a) The scale, height, and form of the extension should be subservient to the existing building, and should be in character with the street scene. Where appropriate, special regard should be had to sustaining and enhancing the setting and features of heritage assets and the Areas of Townscape Character.*
- b) The traditional boundary treatment of an area is retained and where feasible reinforced.*
- c) Suitable access and on-site parking is provided without detriment to neighbouring properties.*
- d) Amenities such as access, noise, privacy, daylight, sunlight and outlook of adjoining residents are safeguarded.*
- e) Gaps which provide views out of the village to surrounding countryside are maintained.*
- f) Materials are compatible with materials of existing/surrounding buildings*

The proposed single storey rear and side extension would be of an appropriate scale and would be subordinate in height to the existing dwelling. It is considered that the crown roof design of the extension would coordinate well with the existing property and that the extension would be of a similar character and design to the existing dwelling.

The proposed extension would be set-back from the front of the house, which would define the original dwelling. Although the irregular shape of the extension is considered to be complicated, it is not considered harmful enough to warrant the refusal of this application. The extension would largely be screened from the street scene by the proposed fence and therefore it is not considered that the proposal would be harmful to the street scene. The proposal would not close an important gap or view and is therefore considered to not be harmful to the character of the area. As the proposal includes materials to match the existing, it is considered that the development would provide a consistent finish

Taking into account the above, the proposal is considered to address the scale and character of the existing and surrounding buildings and townscape. As such the proposal is deemed to comply with the above part of policy DP26 of the District Plan, Policy CDNP04.1 of the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan and principles DG49 and DG50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.

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);"

On the western side is 2 Oakley Grove, which would be some 14.7 metres from the proposed development. Given the separation distance it is not considered that the proposal would cause harm to the amenities of this neighbour.

On the northern side is 5 Oakley Grove, which would be some 17.7 metres from the proposed development. Given the separation distance it is not considered that the proposal would cause harm to the amenities of this neighbour.

Due to the domestic nature of the proposed development, it is considered that there would not be a harmful impact in terms of noise, air and light pollution.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would not cause harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore deemed to accord with the above-mentioned part of policy DP26 of the District Plan.

Impact on trees

Policy DP37 of the Mid Sussex Plan relates to trees and states:

'The District Council will support the protection and enhancement of trees, woodland and hedgerows, and encourage new planting. In particular, ancient woodland and aged or veteran trees will be protected.

Development that will damage or lead to the loss of trees, woodland or hedgerows that contribute, either individually or as part of a group, to the visual amenity value or character of an area, and/ or that have landscape, historic or wildlife importance, will not normally be permitted.

Proposals for new trees, woodland and hedgerows should be of suitable species, usually native, and where required for visual, noise or light screening purposes, trees, woodland and hedgerows should be of a size and species that will achieve this purpose.

Trees, woodland and hedgerows will be protected and enhanced by ensuring development:

- o incorporates existing important trees, woodland and hedgerows into the design of new development and its landscape scheme; and*
- o prevents damage to root systems and takes account of expected future growth; and*
- o where possible, incorporates retained trees, woodland and hedgerows within public open space rather than private space to safeguard their long-term management; and*
- o has appropriate protection measures throughout the development process; and*
- o takes opportunities to plant new trees, woodland and hedgerows within the new development to enhance on-site green infrastructure and increase resilience to the effects of climate change; and*
- o does not sever ecological corridors created by these assets.*

Proposals for works to trees will be considered taking into account:

- o the condition and health of the trees; and*
- o the contribution of the trees to the character and visual amenity of the local area; and*
- o the amenity and nature conservation value of the trees; and*
- o the extent and impact of the works; and*
- o any replanting proposals.*

The felling of protected trees will only be permitted if there is no appropriate alternative. Where a protected tree or group of trees is felled, a replacement tree or group of trees, on a minimum of a 1:1 basis and of an appropriate size and type, will normally be required. The replanting should take place as close to the felled tree or trees as possible having regard to the proximity of adjacent properties.

Development should be positioned as far as possible from ancient woodland with a minimum buffer of 15 metres maintained between ancient woodland and the development boundary.'

One oak tree with a Tree Preservation Order is in proximity of the proposed extension. The MSDC Tree Officer was consulted on the application and considered the proposal. No objection has been raised providing a condition is included to secure the submitted Arboriculture Impact Assessment (AIA), Method Statement (AMS) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP).

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 considered to be appropriate in terms of design, size and scale to the dwellinghouse and locality, and would not cause harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties.

In conclusion, the proposal complies with Mid Sussex District Plan policy DP26, Policy CDNP04.1 of the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant provisions of the NPPF. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Catherine Cardin