Horsham District Council

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:
DC/23/1640
4 Ellis Road, Broadbridge Heath, West Sussex, RH12 3GR

DESCRIPTION:
Erection of a single storey side and rear extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY
None relevant

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES
The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):
Policy 31- Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 32- Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33- Development Principles

Neighbourhood Plan:
Broadbridge Heath has not been designated as a Neighbourhood Plan area.

REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS RESPONSES

Consultations:
Natural England: Standing Advice:-

It cannot be concluded that existing abstraction within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone is not having an adverse effect on the integrity of the Arun Valley SAC/SPA/Ramsar sites. Developments within Sussex North must therefore must not add to this impact and one way of achieving this is to demonstrate water neutrality. The definition of water neutrality is the use of water in the supply area before the development is the same or lower after the development is in place.

To achieve this Natural England is working in partnership with all the relevant authorities to secure water neutrality collectively through a water neutrality strategy. Whilst the strategy is evolving, Natural England advises that decisions on planning applications should await its completion. However, if there are applications which a planning authority deems critical to proceed in the absence of the strategy, then Natural England advises that any application needs to demonstrate water neutrality.

Parish Comments:
No objection, provided there are no material objections from owners of the adjoining / adjacent properties.

Representations:
Two representations were received (from 1 address) objecting to the proposal for the following reasons:-

- The proximity of the extension to the boundary line would be overbearing, with neighbouring gardens small.
- Loss of light from the north-east elevation.
- The proposal should be set further away from the boundary line, which would allow retention of an existing wooden fence and create a softer appearance.

One representation was received in support of the proposal.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND EQUALITY:
The application has been considered having regard to Article 1 of the First Protocol of the Human Rights Act 1998, which sets out a person's rights to the peaceful enjoyment of property and Article 8 of the same Act, which sets out their rights in respect to private and family life and for the home. Officers consider that the proposal would not be contrary to the provisions of the above Articles.

The application has also been considered in accordance with Horsham District Council's public sector equality duty, which seeks to prevent unlawful discrimination, to promote equality of opportunity and to foster good relations between people in a diverse community, in accordance with Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010. In this case, the proposal is not anticipated to have any potential impact from an equality perspective.

PLANNING ASSESSMENT
This application is for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension at 4 Ellis Road, Broadbridge Heath. 4 Ellis Road is a new build semidetached property built slightly away from the main road. Ellis Road is within a modern development in Broadbridge Heath and is comprises semi-detached and detached properties of a consistent character and appearance.

Character and Appearance

Policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF seek to ensure that development promotes a high standard and quality of design in order to enhance and protect locally distinctive characters. The policies also seek to ensure that the scale, massing and appearance of development relates sympathetically with the built surroundings, landscape, open spaces and routes within and adjoining the site, including any impact on the skyline and important views.

The proposal entails for erection of a single-storey side and rear extension, which would wrap around the north-eastern corner of the dwelling. As part of the application process an amended was received to incorporate a pitched roof to the extension. The proposal is considered to be of a design, form and scale which is appropriate to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, and which would not harm the character or appearance of the wider area. It is therefore considered that the visual impact of the proposal is acceptable and would accord with the above policies.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

Policy 33 of the HDPF states that permission will be granted for development that does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of the occupiers/users of nearby properties and land.

The adjoining property within the semi-detached pair lies to the south of the application site, with the existing shared side boundary marked by close boarded fencing. The proposed extension would feature a modest rear projection (of 3 metres) with a height of between approximately 2.5 and 3.4 metres. While the extension would be clearly visible from the rear of the adjoining property is it considered that the proposed depth (and the remaining depth of the rear garden) together with the extensive ground floor glazing to the rear bay would be sufficient to ensure the proposal did not appear harmfully overbearing or result in an unacceptable loss of light or outlook. It is appreciated that the neighbouring property also features a detached (brick-built) outbuilding to the south. It is not though considered, given the factors set out above, that the combination of the outbuilding and proposed extension would result in unacceptable harm, with the existing outbuilding considered to have a greater impact on the rear of the neighbouring property than would result from the proposed extension.

There would be sufficient separation from the remaining adjoining properties and land as to prevent any unacceptable harm.

As such, though the development would be clearly noticeable for neighbouring dwellings it is not considered that unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity would result, in accordance with the above policy.

Water Neutrality

There is no clear or compelling evidence to suggest the nature and scale of the proposed development would result in a more intensive occupation of the dwelling necessitating an increased consumption of water that would result in a significant impact on the Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. The grant of planning permission would not therefore adversely affect the integrity of these sites or otherwise conflict with policy 31 of the HDPF, NPPF paragraph 180 and the Council's obligations under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered to comply with relevant local and national planning policies and is therefore recommended for approval.

Recommendation: Application Permitted

Conditions:

2 **Standard Time Condition**: The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

3 **Regulatory Condition**: The materials and finishes of all new external walls, windows and roofs of the development hereby permitted shall match in type, colour and texture those of the existing building.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

POSITIVE AND PROACTIVE STATEMENT
Statement pursuant to Article 35 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by assessing the proposal against all material considerations, including planning policies and any representations that may have been received, in order to be able to, where possible, grant permission.

Plans list for: DC/23/1640
(The approved plans will form Condition 1 on the Decision Notice of all Permitted applications)

Schedule of plans/documents **approved**:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Floor plan	Proposed ground	DE1190/03 REV P1	04.09.2023
Roof plan	Proposed	DE1190/04 REV P1	04.09.2023
Location & Block plan		DE1190/01 REV P2	02.10.2023

Elevation & Floor plan	Existing	DE1190/02 REV P1	04.09.2023
Elevation plan	Proposed	DE1190/05 OPTION 1	24.11.2023

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial J.Burrowes Date: 13/12/2023

Authorising Officer sign/initial Guy Everest Date: 15.12.2023