



## **DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET**

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

DC/26/0475

18 Heron Way, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 6DQ

### **DESCRIPTION:**

Erection of a two storey rear extension with double pitched roof and a single storey side extension. Replacement of existing front porch. Extension of existing front facade. Extension of rear patio.

### **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:**

|            |                                                                   |                                     |
|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| DC/19/1584 | Erection of a single storey side and a two storey rear extension. | Application Permitted on 30.09.2019 |
|------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|

### **RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES**

#### **The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

#### **Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):**

Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development

Policy 33 - Development Principles

#### **Horsham Blueprint Business Neighbourhood Plan (HBBNP) 2019 – 2036:**

Policy HB3: Character of Development

Policy HB4: Design of Development

#### **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.

**Southern Water:** No objection

#### Neighbourhood Council Comments:

It is unclear from the site plan what type of trees these are and whether they are covered by TPOs or any planning conditions. Any trees add to the wildlife habitat and FNC hopes that they will be retained. If they are to be removed, can it be a condition that the trees are not removed during the nesting season.

#### Representations:

None received

#### 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.

#### **Background**

Planning permission was previously granted under ref: DC/19/1584 for a near identical scheme comprising a single storey side and a two storey rear extension. This permission was not though commenced within the required time period and has therefore expired. This current application has therefore been submitted to seek a new planning permission for the development.

#### **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.

Policy HB3, Character of Development, of the Horsham Blueprint Business Neighbourhood Plan states that, "Development is expected to preserve and enhance the Character Area in which it is located. The design of new development should take account of the local context and reflect the character and vernacular of the area, using architectural variety in form and materials, in order to avoid building design that is inappropriate to the Plan area. Innovation in design will be supported, however, where this demonstrably enhances the quality of the built form in a character area".

Policy HB4, Design of Development, of the Horsham Blueprint Business Neighbourhood Plan states that – "Development is expected to demonstrate a high quality of design, which responds and integrates well with its surroundings"

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two storey rear extension with double pitched roof and a single storey side extension. Replacement of existing front porch. Extension of existing front facade. Extension of rear patio.

The proposed two storey rear extension would be set below the height of the main ridge of the host dwelling. Although considered to be a relatively large addition to the rear of the host property, it is considered that the proposal would reflect the form, scale and detailing of the existing building and would appear as a coherent and sympathetic addition. The proposed extension would not be particularly visible from a public vantage point, and it is considered that given the mixture of building forms and designs making up the dwellings within the vicinity the proposed works would not have a detrimental impact on the host property or the character or appearance of the wider area.

The proposed single storey side extension to the north elevation, replacement of existing front porch and extension of existing front facade, are considered to be an acceptable design, form and scale appropriate to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling.

The proposal also includes the extension of rear patio. The patio would be adjacent to outdoor amenity spaces serving neighbouring properties, and patios of this nature are neither unusual nor unexpected within a domestic residential setting. Having regard to the relationship with neighbouring properties, it is considered that the use of the extended patio for normal domestic purposes would not result in an unacceptable level of noise, disturbance, or harm to neighbouring residential amenity.

The proposals in their entirety would be clearly subservient additions and are 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.

Whilst it is noted that the proposal includes the installation of a window to the north (side) elevation, the rooms served by these openings are not considered to be habitable rooms. As such, the alterations would not result in harmful overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring properties beyond that which currently exists. The proposal is therefore not considered to result in any material harm to residential amenity and is acceptable in this regard. Furthermore, the scale of the proposed additions, coupled with the orientation of the application site in relation to the nearest neighbouring dwellings, is not considered to result in any adverse amenity harm by way of overbearing or overshadowing.

It is considered that the siting and layout of the proposed extension and the resulting relationship with adjoining properties would be sufficient to prevent any unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity.

### **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 currently exempt from the statutory requirement to demonstrate a 10% net gain in biodiversity.

## Other Matters

Officers note the Neighbourhood Council's comments relating to the trees on the boundary of the site. For clarity: these trees are not subject of protection under a Tree Preservation Order (TPO), and as the site is not located within a Conservation Area, the applicant is able to prune / fell the trees without prior consent of the Local Planning Authority. The submitted block plan indicates that trees may be removed subject to the design of the foundation. Therefore, it is not known whether or not these tree/s would be removed as part of the proposal. As above, consent is not required for their removal in any case.

Comments relating to the imposition of a condition relating to the removal of trees outside of a nesting season is noted. It is a criminal offence to intentionally take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird whilst it is in use or being built under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. As such, the responsibility rests with the applicant to ensure that a wildlife crime is not committed in the event that the trees are to be removed. As the trees are not protected, there is no planning statute to warrant the imposition of such a condition that would be reasonable under the tests of Paragraph 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024). However, an informative is attached below to remind the applicant of their obligation to adhere to the provisions of the WCA1981.

## 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 to be used in the development hereby permitted shall strictly accord with those indicated on the approved proposed elevations plans drawings numbered 26.02.21 received 17.03.2026.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail in the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

### Note to Applicant – Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981

The Local Planning Authority notes that the trees on the northern boundary of the site are indicated for potential removal. The applicant is reminded that it is a criminal offence to intentionally take, damage or destroy the nest of any wild bird whilst it is in use or being built under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. As such, in the event that the trees are to be removed, the applicant is advised to ensure that any felling takes place outside of a nesting season.

### 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/26/0475**Schedule of plans/documents **approved:**

| Plan Type      | Description           | Drawing Number | Received Date |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Site plan      | Existing and Proposed | 26.02.21       | 20.04.2026    |
| Block plan     | Existing/Proposed     | 26.02.21       | 17.03.2026    |
| Floor plan     | Existing              | 26.02.21       | 17.03.2026    |
| Elevation plan | Existing              | 26.02.21       | 17.03.2026    |
| Floor plan     | Proposed Ground       | 26.02.21       | 17.03.2026    |
| Floor plan     | Proposed First        | 26.02.21       | 17.03.2026    |
| Elevation plan | Proposed Front        | 26.02.21       | 17.03.2026    |
| Elevation plan | Proposed Rear         | 26.02.21       | 17.03.2026    |
| Elevation plan | Proposed Side         | 26.02.21       | 17.03.2026    |
| Elevation plan | Proposed Side         | 26.02.21       | 17.03.2026    |
| Roof plan      | Proposed              | 26.02.21       | 17.03.2026    |
| Location plan  |                       | NONE           | 17.03.2026    |

**DELEGATED**Case Officer sign/initial Marie Riggs Date: 29.04.2026Authorising Officer sign/initial RHERMITAGE Date: 11.05.2026