



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

OFFICER CHECKLIST	
WEEK ONE (Date Valid)	1st June 2026
Check Neighbours	☒
Check Consultations (including newts) / Press List	☒
Check Description, Plans and Supporting Documents	☒
Print and Display Site Notice (if required)	☐
WEEK TWO (+7)	8th June 2026
Visit Site or request site visit photos (in accordance with Site Visit Guidance Note)	☒
Draft HRA / AA if necessary. If the water statement is insufficient discuss with TL / PPO whether to discuss / accept amendments to the strategy.	☐
Instruct Legal if s106 required (with prior TL / PPO agreement)	☐
WEEK THREE (+14)	15th June 2026
If amendments are likely to be needed discuss with TL / PPO (N.B. Only minor amendments will be accepted in accordance with the Amendment Guidance). When requesting amendments give clear deadline (i.e. start of week 5).	☐
WEEK FOUR (+21)	22nd June 2026
If no amendments required, contact agent / applicant with update on progress.	☒
Confirm whether delegated or committee decision (re: parish and neighbour representations)	☒
WEEK FIVE (+28)	29th June 2026
14-day re-consultation letters to be sent on any amended plans	☐
Prepare draft report	☒
WEEK SIX (+35)	6th July 2026
Check 35-day Cllr call-in for Committee	☐
If decision based on original plans, report to be drafted and submitted for sign off	☐
WEEK SEVEN (+42)	13th July 2026
If decision based on amended plans, report to be drafted and submitted for sign off	☐
Reason for EOT	☐

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/26/0888
20 Ingram Road, Steyning, West Sussex, BN44 3PF

DESCRIPTION:

Side and rear extensions and increased roof height to existing garage.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/05/2202 Extension to existing rear dormer Application Permitted on 01.11.2005

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

Policy 41 - Parking

Steining Neighbourhood Plan and relevant policies to all reports

SNDP3 Contribution to Character

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

Policy 19: Development Quality

Policy 20: Development Principles

Policy 25: Parking

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.

Consultations:

Parish Comments:

Objects due to lack of information, floor plans and detail.

Representations:

X2 representations have been received, objecting the application for the following reasons:

- The proposal is considered to be out of keeping with the character of the area and would disrupt the uniform appearance of the linked garages.
- Concerns are raised regarding the increased height and altered design of the garage, including the replacement of the side door with a wider garage door.
- The extension is considered likely to result in overshadowing and a loss of outlook to the neighbouring garden.
- Objection is raised to the proposed boundary/party wall arrangement, with a request that the development remains wholly within the applicant's land.

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. A site visit was carried out following the objections received.

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 SNDP3 of the Neighbourhood Plan states development proposals which demonstrate how they will positively contribute towards Steyning's character will be supported. Development proposals should respect the amenity of properties in their immediate locality, and respond positively and sensitively to the scale, mass, height, building materials and form of neighbouring properties.

The application site relates to a detached dwelling located at 20 Ingram Road, Steyning, within the built-up boundary. The proposal seeks the extension of the existing garage to provide a larger garage and storage. The development would extend beyond the existing footprint of the garage but would remain subservient to the host dwelling and clearly ancillary in function.

An objection has been received suggesting that the proposal would appear out of keeping. Whilst this concern is noted, the proposed extension is relatively modest in scale and would remain visually subordinate to the main dwelling. The design follows the form and appearance of the existing garage and would utilise materials to match the existing property, ensuring a cohesive appearance.

Although the proposal would alter the appearance of the linked garages, it is not considered that the development would appear incongruous or harmful to the character of the area. The extension would be viewed within the context of a varied residential environment where extensions and alterations are not uncommon.

The proposal would be a clearly subservient addition and 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.

An objection has been received raising concerns regarding the impact on outlook, overshadowing, the appearance of the linked garages and the location of the proposed boundary wall. The majority of the extension would be positioned within the applicant's rear garden and, whilst it would introduce additional built form, it is not considered excessive in scale. Given the modest height of the extension and its relationship with neighbouring properties, it is not considered that the proposal would result in a significant loss of light or unacceptable overshadowing to the adjoining garden. Whilst some change to outlook may occur, this is typical of residential development and would not be sufficiently harmful to warrant refusal.

Concerns relating to the position of the boundary wall, ownership of land and the creation of any party wall are civil matters falling outside the scope of the planning system. These issues would need to be resolved separately between the affected landowners and do not form part of the planning assessment.

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.

Impact on Parking

Policy 41 of the Horsham District Planning Framework allows development involving the loss of

existing parking spaces where suitable alternative provision is secured or where any shortfall would not result in unacceptable harm. Policy SNP14 of the Southwater Neighbourhood Plan seeks to resist the loss of garages unless replacement parking is provided within the curtilage.

The proposal would retain the existing garage function and associated parking provision. The submitted plans indicate that the garage would accommodate two parking spaces, and therefore no parking provision would be lost as a result of the development. Given that the proposal does not alter the number of parking spaces available within the site, it is not considered that the development would result in any additional demand for on-street parking or give rise to any highway safety concerns. Accordingly, the proposal is considered acceptable in parking terms.

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 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/26/0888

(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
Plans	As Existing	ADC1714/01	01.06.2026
Plans	As Proposed	ADC1714/02 Rev A	01.06.2026
Location & Block plan	Site Plans	ADC1714/LP	01.06.2026

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Meg Bayliss Date: 13/07/2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial Tamara Dale Date: 27/07/2026