

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/2011	Case Officer:	Caroline Grist
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Remodelling of bungalow into a two-storey dwelling, including first-floor and two-storey rear extensions, fenestration alterations with associated landscaping and demolition of existing rear garage, erection of two storey detached garage to the front with first floor office, along with new access driveway.		
Site:	Chideok, Valebridge Road, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 0RT, , ,		
Validation Date	15 Dec 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Refusal	Recommendation Date:	5 Feb 2026
Target Date:	9 Feb 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Caroline Grist</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	6 Feb 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/2011

**Chideok, Valebridge Road, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 0RT, ,
Remodelling of bungalow into a two-storey dwelling, including first-floor and two-storey rear extensions, fenestration alterations with associated landscaping and demolition of existing rear garage, erection of two storey detached garage to the front with first floor office, along with new access driveway.**

Mr James Bowtell

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

One representation has been received in objection to the proposal. In summary it raises the following concerns:

- o Proposal would lead to overdevelopment;
- o Scale of the proposal is disproportionate to the size of the present site, particularly as size of the site has been reduced; and
- o Development is much greater in scale and quantum to application CD/017/91, which was refused despite the site at the time being significantly larger.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Highways Authority

This application seeks the remodelling of an existing bungalow into a two-storey dwelling, including associated extensions and alterations, with replacement garage and new access driveway. The site is located on Valebridge Road, a C-classified road subject to a speed restriction of 40 mph in this location.

The existing vehicle access point is to be closed and relocated north to form a new shared drive. From inspection of WSCC mapping, there are no apparent visibility concerns with the proposed vehicle access point. The proposed access works will be subject to a licence obtained from WSCC, and constructed to a specification agreed with a WSCC Highway Area Engineer.

A replacement garage is proposed, providing two car parking spaces for the property and provision for the secure storage of bicycles. Sufficient space exists within the demonstrated drive layout to accommodate a third off-street car parking space if required, which would bring the site in line with WSCC Parking Standards. On-site turning also appears achievable within the site.

In summary, the LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 116), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

If the LPA are minded to approve the application, an informative is recommended in relation to obtaining a vehicle cross over licence.

Drainage Engineer

The site lies within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore at very low risk of fluvial flooding. The Risk of Flooding from Surface Water mapping suggests the site is shown to be at very low to high surface water flood risk (comparable to flood zones 1 to 3b). This is associated with an overland flow route in the rear garden.

The proposed extension (built footprint) is located outside of the Flood Zone 3b extent for surface water.

The proposed application is a minor development and fits within the EA Standing Advice.

We have no objection to the proposed development on flood risk grounds. An informative is recommended to draw the applicant's attention to the Environment Agency's Standing Advice.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

ASPC have no objection as long as it is restricted use and tied to the house, i.e. not businesses or separate accommodation.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought to re-model a bungalow into a two-storey dwelling, including first-floor and two-storey rear extensions, fenestration alterations with associated landscaping and demolition of existing rear garage, erection of two storey detached garage to the front with first floor office, along with new access driveway.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

CD/017/91 - Extension to form chalet bungalow and integral garage. Refused.

CD/042/89 - Extension of existing bungalow to form chalet bungalow. Refused.

DM/19/3910 - Demolition of existing dwelling and garage. Replacement 2 storey 5 bedroom house with rear facing juliette balcony. Permission.

DM/25/2091 - Construction of 3 no. hip to gable extensions to the sides and rear of the existing property. Permission.

Land to the rear of Chideok

DM/20/2572 - Outline application for erection of two new detached dwellings with all matters reserved apart from access. Refused.

DM/20/4590 - Outline application for erection of two new detached dwellings with all matters reserved apart from access and layout. Withdrawn.

DM/25/2071 - Construction of 2 no houses with detached garages. Invalid.

Lewes District Council

LW/20/0489 - Outline application for two additional dwellings with access and layout reserved. Refused.

LW/21/0020 - Outline application for two additional dwellings with design, scale and landscaping reserved. Permission.

LW/24/0428 - Approval of reserved matters including design, scale and landscaping relating to Outline Approval LW/21/0020 for two additional dwellings. Permission.

LW/25/0128 - Erection of 2no. dwelling-houses with detached garages and associated landscaping. Pending Consideration.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Chideok is a modest, west facing bungalow that is situated on a corner plot. It is finished in rough render, with a tiled roof and upvc windows. The submitted plans show a detached garage to the rear of the dwelling, but this appeared to have been demolished at the time of the Case Officer's site visit.

Approximately the front two thirds of the site lies within the district boundary of Mid Sussex District Council, with the remainder of the site falling within the boundary of Lewes District Council. A new access has been created to the north of the site that leads to land to the east. This land was formally part of Chideok and now forms a separate plot of land. Permission has been previously granted by Lewes District Council for two houses on this land, with an access from Mill Rose Way. Applications have been submitted again for two houses on the same land, but using the new access from Valebridge Lane.

Valebridge Road, a classified road, is located to the west of the site, whilst Mill Rose Way is to the south. Neighbouring dwellings are located along Valebridge Road to the north, and to the east off Mill Rose Way. The application site is situated outside of the built up area of Burgess Hill and therefore lies within the countryside.

APPLICATION DETAILS

This application seeks planning permission, through a range of extensions and alterations, to remodel the existing bungalow into a two storey dwelling. A two storey extension is firstly proposed to the rear. This would contain a kitchen and dining room on the ground floor and a bedroom on the first floor. It is to be some 4.0 metres deep and would span the width of the house.

It is also proposed to increase the eaves and ridge heights of the dwelling. They are currently approximately 2.6 metres and 5.0 metres, which would increase to 3.5 metres and 6.8 metres. The roof form would also change from a hipped roof, to a gable with 'M' shaped sections on the side elevations. An oversailing first floor window is also proposed on the front elevation that would project some 1.2 metres. The works to the first floor would allow the dwelling to accommodate four bedrooms, two en-suits and a bedroom. Associated changes are proposed to the windows and doors.

The scheme also includes the construction of a detached garage in the south western corner of the site. It is to be 6.6 metres wide and 6.5 metres deep. It is to measure some 3.3 metres to the eaves and 6.6 metres to the ridge. First floor accommodation is to be created inside the building and is to be accessed via an external stair case on the southern elevation.

Lastly, permission is sought for changes to the access to the property. Previously the access from Valebridge Road was located opposite the front elevation. It is proposed for it to be sited on the north western corner of the plot. It was noted during the Case Officer's site visit that the new access had been created and, as such, this part of the development is retrospective.

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:

DP12 - Protection and Enhancement of Countryside

DP21 - Transport

DP26 - Character and Design

DP37 - Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows

Site Allocation Development Plan Document

The Site Allocation DPD was adopted on 29th June 2022. It allocates sufficient housing and employment land to meet identified needs to 2031.

There are no relevant policies.

Other Material Considerations

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 the majority of 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
DPS6 - Health and Wellbeing
DPN4 - Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows
DPC1 - Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside
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 2023)

ASSESSMENT

Design and impact upon the character of the area

The proposed development is located within the countryside, therefore policy DP12 of the District Plan is relevant. The principal aim of Policy DP12 of the District Plan states the

'countryside will be protected in recognition of its intrinsic character and beauty.'

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:

- 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.'*

The Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD also provides advice for extensions to dwellings. 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.

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.

There are two general approaches to extending a property:

- o *Designing in the style of the existing building by closely matching its facing materials, architectural features, window sizes and proportions; and*
- o *Designing in a contemporary style that takes its cues from key aspects of the existing building that might include its underlying form and proportions, facing materials, window design and other specific architectural features. The success of this approach is particularly reliant on high quality facing materials and finishes, and this will normally need to be demonstrated through detailed elevations and section drawings.*

Both approaches can create successful, well-designed extensions that can be mutually beneficial to both the house and the wider area'.

Principle DG51 relates specifically to rear extensions and 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'.

DG52 relates to roof extensions and states that:

'The roof pitch and form are intrinsic to a building's character and roof extensions should be sensitive to this'.

The application relates to a bungalow situated on Valebridge Road, where houses are situated along the eastern side of the highway. Houses are set back from the road and are situated on comfortable plots. Trees, hedging and planting are present along both sides of Valebridge Road. Overall there is a verdant and more spacious character to this area, consistent with its countryside designation.

Planning permission is firstly sought to undertake a two storey rear extension as well as a first floor extension to the existing bungalow, in order to create a two storey dwelling.

As set out within the Design Guide, it is expected that extensions should be designed to respond appropriately to the host dwelling and ensure that they would remain subordinate. The application property is modest bungalow, expressed through low eaves, and does not have any first floor accommodation. It is considered that the scale of the proposed extensions are such that they would not

appear subordinate and would dominate the host dwelling. With regards to the design of the extensions, it is considered that they would not appear sympathetic to the host dwelling and do not present a cohesive scheme together. The front and rear elevations appear closer to a chalet design, which is in stark contrast to side elevations that would present a fully expressed two storey dwelling. The lack of cohesion is also reflected in aspects such as the window design. Along the northern and southern elevations, numerous windows are proposed of varying sizes and designs in a scattered arrangement. In contrast few features are proposed on the western and eastern elevations, but still have an unbalanced appearance.

It is considered that the above harms would be exacerbated due to the property being located on a corner plot. Views are obtained to the property not just from Valebridge Road, but also from Mill Rose Way to the south. Mill Rose Way is a recent residential development, with a wide and open access from Valebridge Road. Views to the side of Chidoek can therefore easily be obtained. To the south of this access is Valewood, a bungalow with no apparent first floor accommodation. The two bungalows on either side of the access contribute to the openness of the area. It is therefore considered that the proposed extensions would appear very dominant and the form and design of the southern side elevation would be highly visible, creating a jarring addition that would be out of keeping with the character of the area.

Planning permission is also sought for a detached garage to the south western corner of the site. This building would also have first floor accommodation, which would be accessed by an external staircase. Garages are intended to provide ancillary accommodation to dwellinghouses and, as such, should appear subordinate to the host dwelling. The proposed ridge height of the garage, however, is to be some 6.6 metres, approximately 0.2 metres lower than the intended height of Chideok. The proposed scale of the building would therefore visually compete with the main house and would be re-enforced through the addition of first floor windows, particularly given their vertical proportions.

The proposed garage would also appear unduly prominent, as it is to be sited close to the boundary with Mill Rose Way. It is noted that there is a garage building in the front garden of Keepers, the neighbour to the north, however no planning permission has been identified for this building and forward garages are not a feature of the area. The undeveloped front gardens are considered to contribute to the open character of the area and a garage in this location would not normally be supported. In comparison to the proposed building, the garage at Keepers has a lower eaves height and reads closer to a single storey building, particularly as the external staircase of the proposed garage is to be sited on the southern elevation.

It is acknowledged that planning permission was granted for a replacement dwelling at Chideok in 2019 (DM/19/3910), which is referenced in the Design and Access Statement. Whilst the plans shown in the document were submitted, they do not show the scheme approved by Mid Sussex District Council. The revised plans show a roofline that was reduced by 1.5 metres, which also affected the proportions and appearance of the replacement dwelling. Changes were also made to the northern and eastern elevations, where dormer windows were proposed to provide first floor accommodation. It is considered that the revised scheme represented a coherent design that would not be comparable to the development currently under consideration. A detached garage to the front of the property was also removed from this application.

The submitted Design and Access Statement also notes that the development would mostly be in accordance with permitted development rights other than the front gable extension, first floor extension to the rear and the garage to the front of the property. It should be noted that under permitted development extensions cannot exceed the existing ridge height, which is a central part of the works to the house.

It is therefore considered that the proposed design of the extensions and garage would be unacceptable and would have a harmful impact to the streetscene and the character of the countryside area. The development would therefore fail to comply with policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and the requirements of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan seeks to ensure that new 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 DP27)*'.

In terms of the impact on surrounding properties the neighbour closest to the development is Keepers, to the north. This neighbour has a close boarded fence along its southern boundary and one high level window, in the side elevation, above the eaves. Additionally there is the newly created access between the houses, some 6.0 metres wide, and the works would not result in Chideok being deeper than Keepers. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not result in a significant loss of light or outlook to this neighbour. It is noted that a number of windows are proposed across the northern elevation. Due to the boundary treatments, the ground floor windows would not result in any direct overlooking. One first floor window would relate to a landing and the most rearwards would relate to a bathroom and en-suite and, as such, would be obscure glazed. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not result in a significant loss of privacy to Keepers.

Due to the domestic nature of the development, it is considered that there would not be a significant impact on noise, air or light pollution.

The proposal would therefore not result in harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and would therefore accord with this part of policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan.

Impact to trees

Policy DP37 of the Mid Sussex District Plan relates to trees. This policy supports the protection and enhancement of trees and does not support development that will lead to the damage or loss of trees that contribute to the visual amenity value or character of an area. It goes on to set out how trees will be protected and enhanced during development.

An Arboricultural Method Statement, Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Tree Protection Plan have been submitted as part of this application, which identify five trees along the western boundary as well as a small group in the south western corner of the site. The information provided has been considered by the Tree Officer, who has commented on this application.

With regards to the creation of the new access, the retrospective nature of this part of the development is advised as regrettable as it involved type 1 being laid and presumably compacted. It is advised that these works would have probably caused damage to the trees and the Method Statement is mainly concerned with removing the compacted material and soil amelioration and replacing it with an above ground engineered solution, to prevent further compaction.

The proposed garage is to be sited towards the south western corner of the site, located under tree canopies and with the Root Protection Area (RPA) of T4, an oak. The Tree Officer has advised that the submitted tree information does not set out how this aspect of the development would not have an impact on the trees or what would occur if roots are discovered during building works.

The Tree Officer has identified that the Method Statement sets out that no materials are to be stored within the fenced area, however it does not state that they will not be kept within RPAs and the fencing does not cover the whole RPAs.

Concern has also been raised regarding future pressure on the trees, including the oak and Lawson's cypress that are both Category B. The Tree Officer has raised concern that the proposed development will be closer to these trees and there may, therefore, be more of an impact on light availability. This may lead to the trees being pruned regularly, which may be detrimental to the health of the trees. The fence that has been installed raise additional concerns for the future of these trees.

The concerns raised by the Tree Officer are shared by the Case Officer that there is insufficient information in relation to the trees and all of the proposed works. These trees, whilst not formally protected, are very visible and are considered to make a positive contribution to the verdant character of this countryside area. As such the application, as submitted, could result in damage to trees, including

Category B trees, that contribute to the character of the area. The application would therefore fail to comply with the requirements of policy DP37 of the Mid Sussex District Plan.

Highways Safety

Policy DP21 of the District Plan seeks to ensure that schemes are sustainably located to minimise the need for travel, however as per paragraph 85 of the NPPF, notes that there may be circumstances where development needs to be located in the countryside, such as rural economic uses. The policy also seeks to protect the safety of road users and pedestrians, and seeks to provide adequate parking in relation to development proposals.

The application seeks planning permission for a new access to the property from Valebridge, which has been created, as well as extensions to the dwelling and a new garage. Valebridge Road is C classified road with a speed restriction of 40mph in this location.

The Highways Authority have commented on this proposal. With regards to the new access it is advised that there are no apparent visibility concerns and that a licence would be required from the Highways Authority. With regards to the other works, it is noted that the garage would provide two parking spaces and the site layout could accommodate a third space. As such the development would be in line with the adopted Parking Standards. It is also advised that on-site turning also appears achievable.

The Highways Authority have therefore concluded that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network. It is therefore considered that the development would be acceptable in terms of highways matters and would therefore accord with the requirements of policy DP21 of the Mid Sussex District Council.

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 it is considered that the proposed extensions and alterations to the existing bungalow, through their scale, form and design, would create dominant and unsympathetic additions that would not have a cohesive overall design. These works would be visible from public vantage points and would result in a dominant and jarring feature that would be out of keeping with the open and verdant character of the countryside area. The proposed garage would not appear subordinate and would visually compete with the host dwelling. It would result in the addition prominent feature in the streetscene that would be out of keeping with the open character of this countryside location. In addition insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the trees along the property frontage, including a Category B oak tree, would not be harmed or lost as a result of the development. These trees are visible and are considered to contribute positively to the character of the area. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with Policies DP12, DP26 and DP37 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Decision: Refusal

Case Officer: Caroline Grist