



## **DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET**

### **APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:**

DC/26/0376

1 Bailey Close, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 5QR

### **DESCRIPTION:**

Erection of a single storey front extension, a two-storey rear and side extension with a single storey infill rear extension.

### **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:**

DC/23/0642      Erection of a single storey front extension.

Application    Permitted    on  
12.06.2023

### **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

#### **North Horsham neighbourhood planning**

Voluntary withdrawal of designation: North Horsham Parish Council voluntarily withdrew their parish from the Neighbourhood Development Plan process on 30 July 2018.

#### **Horsham District Local Plan (2023-40) (Regulation 19):**

Policy 19: Development Quality

Policy 20: Development Principles

### **REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS RESPONSES**

Where consultation responses have been summarised, it should be noted that Officers have had consideration of the full comments received, which are available to view on the public file at [www.horsham.gov.uk](http://www.horsham.gov.uk).

### **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.

Southern Water:

In order to protect water apparatus, Southern Water requests that if consent is granted, the following condition is attached to the planning permission; The developer must agree with Southern Water, prior to commencement of the development, the measures to be undertaken to protect/divert the public water supply main.

Representations:

x1 letter of objection received for the following reasons:

- Scale and Massing-Harm to Character of the Area
- Overdevelopment of the plot
- Loss of Light and Overbearing Impact
- Loss of Privacy and Overlooking
- Parking and Highway Safety
- Conflict with Local Planning Policy

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:

The application has been assessed on the basis of the submitted details, together with the planning history of the site and adjoining properties, available images and photographs supplied by the agent. These details were considered sufficient to allow the application to be properly considered and determined.

**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 application site is located within an established residential area of Horsham, characterised by detached and semi-detached dwellings set within clearly defined plots. The site lies within a built-up area where development is acceptable in principle, subject to it being of an appropriate scale and design and causing no unacceptable harm to the character of the area or to residential amenity, in accordance with the above policies.

The application seeks permission for a series of extensions and alterations to an existing semi-detached dwelling. The property is currently a modest residential unit with a clearly defined footprint and a rear garden that is proportionate to its scale.

The proposed development would introduce a significant increase in the overall footprint, bulk and volume of the building through the addition of multiple extensions. Compared to the existing form, the development would substantially enlarge the dwelling, resulting in a materially larger building and a more intensive level of built development across the plot. This is especially acute given the siting of the property on a prominent corner-plot location and one of the first dwellings viewed as you enter into this section of the estate.

The proposal has been assessed having regard to its cumulative scale, bulk and siting. While certain elements of the scheme may appear modest when considered in isolation, it is the combined impact of the extensions and alterations that must be taken into account. In this instance, the overall extent of development is considered excessive in relation to the size of the plot.

As a result, the increased footprint, massing and visual presence would appear disproportionate and out of keeping with the prevailing character of the surrounding area. The proposal would erode the established pattern of development within the street, giving rise to a dwelling that would appear overly dominant and visually unsuitable in the context of neighbouring properties.

Accordingly, the proposal fails to demonstrate high quality design that responds appropriately to its local context, contrary to the above policies, which seek to ensure that development maintains local distinctiveness and is of an appropriate scale, form and layout.

### **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.

Though cumulatively, the extensions to the dwelling would be large, owing to the site, orientation, and maintained separation distances between the dwelling and its neighbours, the proposal would not arise in any adverse harm to neighbouring amenity by way of overbearing or overshadowing. Furthermore, though the extensions comprise additional bulk to the first floor, this would not give rise to additional opportunities of overlooking over and above the existing arrangement. The resultant impact by way of mutual overlooking between the dwelling and its neighbours would remain largely unchanged.

Officers also note that the extensions would consume a larger plan form area and therefore decrease the level of available amenity space. Whilst this loss is regrettable, sufficient space would be retained to ensure enjoyment of private amenity space, albeit smaller than the existing arrangement.

With the above in mind, no objection is raised on amenity grounds.

### **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 193 and the Council's obligations under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

### **Biodiversity Net Gain**

In accordance with the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024, all householder applications are current exempt from the statutory requirement to demonstrate a 10% net gain in biodiversity.

## Conclusion

The proposed development, by reason of its cumulative scale, bulk and extent, would result in an excessive and disproportionate form of development that fails to respect the established character and appearance of the surrounding residential area. The proposal would erode the prevailing pattern of development within the street and give rise to an overly dominant form of development that is visually inappropriate in its context. For these reasons, the proposal is considered contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework and is therefore recommended for refusal.

## **Recommendation: Application Refused**

### Reason for Refusal:

- 1 The proposed development, by reason of its cumulative scale, bulk and extent, would result in an excessive and disproportionate form of development that fails to respect the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 32 and 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/26/0376**

Schedule of plans/documents **not approved**:

| Plan Type       | Description                                  | Drawing Number | Received Date |
|-----------------|----------------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Block plan      |                                              | NONE           | 02.03.2026    |
| Plans           | EXISTING FLOOR, ROOF SECTION AND ELEVATIONS  | BC/05          | 02.03.2026    |
| Location plan   |                                              | NONE           | 02.03.2026    |
| Plans           | PROPOSED FLOOR, ROOF, SECTION AND ELEVATIONS | BC/06          | 02.03.2026    |
| Site plan       |                                              | NONE           | 02.03.2026    |
| Supporting Docs | FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT                        | NONE           | 02.03.2026    |

**DELEGATED**

Case Officer sign/initial      Meg Bayliss      Date: 24/04/2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial      RHERMITAGE      Date: 27.04.2026