

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/2418	Case Officer:	Caroline Grist
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Two-storey side and rear extension. Reconfiguration of front elevation with introduction of render to partially replace hung tile cladding.		
Site:	Dalby, 70 Halsford Park Road, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 1PS, , ,		
Validation Date	9 Oct 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	3 Nov 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Refusal	Recommendation Date:	3 Dec 2025
Target Date:	4 Dec 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Caroline Grist</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Steven King</i>	Date:	4 Dec 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/2418

**Dalby, 70 Halsford Park Road, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 1PS, ,
Two-storey side and rear extension. Reconfiguration of front elevation with introduction of
render to partially replace hung tile cladding.
Ms Amy Loosley**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

One representation has been received in response to this application. In summary, an objection is raised for the following reasons relating to 72 Halsford Park Road:

- o Affect outlook, through presenting a blank wall to their windows, and significantly reducing light to a stairwell; and
- o The 25 and 45 degree test is not met, affecting a number of rooms on the north side, including the kitchen and stairwell, in the afternoon and evening.

The representation goes onto request if the extension is approved that no future windows are to be allowed in the south upper part of the property, so the privacy of the bathroom is not compromised.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Southern Water

The development site is not located within Southern Water's statutory area for water supply services. Please contact South East Water who are the relevant statutory undertaker.

Southern Water has determined that the flow rate for the above site will remain consistent, so capacity is not an issue, and no Southern Water assets will be affected. Therefore, Southern Water has no objections to this proposal.

TOWN COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

The committee recommended approval.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought for a two-storey side and rear extension as well as the re-configuration of front elevation and introduction of render to partially replace hung tile cladding.

RECENT PLANNING HISTORY

There is no recent planning history.

72 Halsford Park Road

01/00921/FUL - Extension to residential property. Permission.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Dalby, 70 Halsford Park Road, is an east facing, two storey, detached dwelling. It is constructed of brick, with tile hanging at the first floor level, a plain tile roof and upvc windows. The dwelling is characterised by a front facing gable and pitched roof window that sits across the eaves line of the main house. It also benefits from an attached flat roof garage to the side and a single storey extension to the rear.

The site is located within the built up area of East Grinstead. Neighbouring dwellings are situated to the north, south and west of the site, whilst the highway is to the east. The dwelling is set back from the highway by a paved parking area and front garden.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The application seeks planning permission to undertake extensions to the dwelling. A two storey side extension is firstly proposed, which would contain a garage at the ground floor and an en-suite and walk in closet above. The garage is to be the same 0.6 metres deeper than the existing structure and would now remain a constant width of some 2.7 metres. The first floor extension is to be some 2.6 metres wide and 5.4 metres deep, leaving approximately 4.4 metres of the garage to the rear as single storey. The remaining garage would have a mono-pitched roof that would measure approximately 2.5 metres to the eaves and 3.4 metres to the ridge. With regards to the first floor, it is proposed to widen the existing front facing gable to accommodate it. The existing eaves height is to be retained but the overall height of the gable is to be increased, to match the ridge line of the main house. It is proposed to finish the roof in tiles to match the host dwelling, whilst the gable frontage and northern elevation is to be finished in white render. The plans also show the side and rear of the garage to be finished in render as well. A ground floor window within the front elevation is also to be reduced in size.

A two storey extension is also proposed to the rear of the house, which would replace the existing single storey addition. It is proposed to use the ground floor as a kitchen and dining room, whilst two bedrooms are proposed at the first floor. This extension is to be some 4.3 metres deep and 8.7 metres wide. A pitched roof design is proposed that would continue the existing eaves line and have a reduced ridge height of approximately 6.7 metres. It is to be finished in brick and tiles to match the host dwelling.

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 East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan was formally made on 2nd November 2016.

Relevant policies:
Policy 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 (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

DPS6 - Health and Wellbeing

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 2024)

ASSESSMENT

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.'*

East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan policy EG3 states:

'Planning permission will normally be granted where development proposals meet the following criteria:

- o The form of the proposed development is proportionate and in keeping with the scale, height, materials and site coverage of the surrounding area;*
- o The layout of the proposed development respects the topography and character of the site, protects important landscape features and does not harm adjoining amenity;*
- o The proposal does not result in the loss of buildings or spaces that would have an unacceptable impact on the character of the area;*
- o The proposal ensures satisfactory means of access for vehicles and pedestrians and provides adequate parking, cycle storage and refuse facilities on site;*
- o The design of new buildings and the layout of spaces, including footways, car and cycle parking areas, should be permeable and provide connectivity with neighbouring areas;*
- o New development must be inclusive and where appropriate make satisfactory provision for the safe and easy access for those with mobility impairment; and*
- o The design of new developments must result in the creation of a safe and secure environment and incorporate adequate security measures and features to deter crime, fear of crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour; and*
- o Proposals make provision for green infrastructure and biodiversity enhancement'.*

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'.

In terms of side extensions, principle DG50 sets out they area

'are typically visible from the public realm and will be resisted where they have an adverse impact on the street scene or the appearance of a dwelling'.

It goes onto state:

'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 relates to rear extensions and sets out:

'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 application relates to an established residential area of East Grinstead, where there is some variety in houses, however they all remain set back from the highway and are of a traditional design and form. This section of Halsford Road is also characterised by the spacing between houses and any built form to the boundary line is single storey, which allows this spacing still to be read.

Planning permission is firstly sought for a two storey side extension, which would be achieved through enlarging the front facing gable. In terms of scale, the proposed addition would not be set back and would increase the height of the gable, thereby not creating a subordinate addition. With regards to the design, the application property is characterised by vertical proportions, which is reflected in the window design and current gable feature. By enlarging the gable, this feature would become elongated and conflict with the proportions of the house. The proportions and balance across this frontage would be further impacted by the ground floor window being reduced in size.

It is also considered that this extension would have a harmful impact on the character of the area. As set out, the streetscene is characterised by the spacing of properties. The proposed side extension would project to the site boundary and fill the space at the first floor level, which would be out of keeping with the surrounding area. It is considered that this would be exacerbated by finishing the first floor in white render. Whilst there are some examples of render in the streetscene, these are infrequent. It is noted that No. 72, to the south, is rendered but this property is a bungalow. There is also render present on 74 Halsford Park Road and, whilst present on a first floor gable, is broken up by large areas of tile hanging. It is considered that the extent of render proposed would appear at odds with the character of surrounding properties and would increase the prominence of the wider, taller gable, further highlighting the harms identified in terms of design and the enclosing of space.

In terms of the rear extension, whilst deep, this addition has been broken up and set in from the side boundaries. It therefore has a level of subordination that is further reinforced by the proposed roof forms. The proposed materials would match the host dwelling and would provide a consistent finish. The two storey rear extension would not be visible from public vantage points and, as such, would not have an adverse impact upon the character of the area.

Policy EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan states that proposals should "not harm" adjoining neighbours amenity whereas policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states that development 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. There is therefore some conflict between the District Plan and Neighbourhood Plan in this respect. Under section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 if a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan, the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approved or published. As such, policy DP26 is considered to take precedence and therefore the test in this instance is whether the development causes significant harm to neighbouring amenities as outlined above.

Concern has been raised regarding the impact to the light and outlook to rooms on the northern elevation of 72 Halsford Park Road. This letter notes that the proposal would fail the 25 and 45 degree tests, which is assumed to refer to those established within the BRE 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice'. Whilst these standards have not been formally adopted by Mid Sussex District Council, they are acknowledged as being a useful tool in assessing the impact

development would have on the light to neighbouring properties. The 25 degree test is used to assess light levels to side windows, whereas the 45 degree test would be used to determine the impact to those on the rear elevation. It should also be noted that the Standard sets out that only habitable rooms should be taken into account, which would not include windows relating to areas such as stairwells or bathrooms.

The proposed extensions would not protrude beyond the rear elevation of No. 72, therefore the rear windows of this neighbour would not be affected and the 45 degree test would not apply. It was observed during the Case Officer's site visit that there were a number of windows along the side elevation of No. 72, facing the site, as well as a dormer window. Half of the windows in the dormer were observed as obscure glazed and, from the information available, it is understood that these windows are not associated with habitable spaces. Also, due to the spacing of properties and the central position of the dormer, it is considered that there would still be a level of outlook available to these windows.

With regards to the ground floor windows, it was noted that the most eastern opening was obscure glazed and the western window appears to relate to the referenced kitchen. It is noted that there is a boundary fence, but it does not fully cover the kitchen window. The existing single storey projection also does not fully obscure the light and outlook available to this window. It is noted that the proposed extension would be set away from the shared boundary by some 4.0 metres, similar to the existing projection, however it would be deeper and increased in height, to a two storey addition. The proposal would fail the 25 degree test, as set out in the BRE good practice guide, and that the available light to this north facing window would be harmfully affected. Furthermore it is considered that the extension would be a more imposing feature, which would also significantly harm the outlook available. It is considered that this harm would be compounded as it is understood that this is the only window associated with the kitchen.

With regards to the impact to 68 Halsford Park Road, this neighbour is to the north of the site and has been previously extended to the rear. It is noted that the width, depth and roof heights of the proposed garage has increased, however it is considered that the increase is such that it would not be sufficient to cause significant harm to the light and outlook available to the closest rear window. With regards to the two storey element of the rear extension, this is to be set behind the garage and the extension would pitch away from No. 68. Given this combination, it is considered that the light and outlook would not be harmed to this neighbour's rear windows. There is one first floor side window that faces onto the proposed development and would be likely to be impacted by the proposed two storey side extension. This window was, however, observed on site to be obscure glazed. Given that this is likely to relate to non-habitable room it is considered that a significant loss of light or outlook would not occur from this extension.

No windows are proposed that would result in any direct overlooking. Given the domestic nature of the proposal there would not be a significantly harmful impact in terms of noise, air or light pollution.

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 proposed two storey side extension would, by virtue of its design, form and scale, create an unsympathetic addition that would harmfully impact the proportions and character of the host dwelling, and would not appear subordinate to the existing building. The extension would be visible within the area, thereby creating an incongruous addition, and would enclose the space to the side of the dwelling that would be out of keeping with the spaciousness and the rhythm of streetscene. The use of white render on the extension would further add to its prominence. The two storey rear extension would also cause significant harm to the amenities of 72 Halsford Park Road, through a loss of light and outlook to a window which is understood to relate to a kitchen.

The proposal therefore would fail to comply with policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policy EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan, principles DG49, DG50 and DG51 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and the relevant provisions contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Decision: Refusal

Case Officer: Caroline Grist