



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/26/0685

Ivy Cottage , The Haven, Billingshurst, West Sussex, RH14 9BS

DESCRIPTION:

Erection of a single storey rear extension and refurbishment works throughout the original building.
(Householder Application).

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

PE/23/0124	Erection of extensions and alterations.	Pre-Application Advice Given on 22.09.2023
PE/25/0175	Re-instate pre-existing horse sand school 60m x 20m)	Pre-Application Advice Given on 01.09.2025
DC/25/1541	Reinstatement of existing sand school and construction of a new horse sand school.	Application Permitted on 05.01.2026
PE/25/0243	Installation of bathroom. Advice on lightening beams. Advise re 1960s and 2000s part of the building	Pre-Application Advice Given on 02.03.2026

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):

Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character

Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection

Policy 28 - Replacement Dwellings and House Extensions in the Countryside

Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity

Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development

Policy 33 - Development Principles

Policy 34 - Cultural and Heritage Assets

Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport

Policy 41 - Parking

Rudgwick Neighbourhood Plan:

The Rudgwick Neighbourhood Plan was formally made on 23 June 2021.

RNP6 - Materials

RNP7 – Architectural Style

RNP8 – Development Height

RNP9 – Street Scene

Parish Design Statement:

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:

HDC Conservation Officer: No Objection - The Conservation Officer raises no heritage objection to the proposed extensions and alterations, considering that the historic core of Ivy Cottage will remain clearly identifiable and retain its prominence. While concerns are expressed regarding the visual impact of the proposed box dormers, these are accepted as they will not be visible in conjunction with the historic part of the dwelling, and the use of vertical boarding will help reduce their suburban appearance. The proposed first-floor bathroom is considered acceptable in principle, provided that pipework can be installed internally without harming significant historic fabric. The replacement of existing windows with thin-section double-glazed units is also supported, as the current windows are not considered historically significant. Conditions are recommended to secure a high-quality and heritage-sensitive implementation of the works.

Place Services: No Objection - No ecological objection is raised, with the submitted bat surveys confirming that no bat roosts are present within the building and that the previously removed apple tree was unlikely to have supported roosting bats, meaning no further surveys are required. The site lies within the consultation zones of The Mens SAC and Ebernoe Common SAC, designated for Barbastelle bats, and contains habitats that may contribute to local bat foraging and commuting routes. To avoid habitat fragmentation and maintain connectivity, compensation is recommended for the loss of the hedgerow and tree through a Biodiversity Compensation and Enhancement Strategy, secured by condition. In addition, because of the potential impact on functionally linked habitat for Barbastelle bats, the proposal should be screened into Stage 2 Appropriate Assessment as part of the Local Planning Authority's Habitats Regulations Assessment.

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: Standard Advice

Parish Comments:

Rudgwick Parish Council: No Objection - No objection is raised in principle, subject to the HDC Conservation Officer being satisfied that the detailed proposals adequately protect the heritage significance of the site. It is noted, however, that the development would increase the scale and massing of the building and should therefore be assessed against HDPF Policy 28 in relation to extensions within the countryside. The proposal also involves the removal of a tree, and any approval should include a condition requiring appropriate replacement planting in accordance with RNP Policy 17. In addition, clarification is required regarding the submitted CIL form, as Part 4 appears either to contain an error or is incomplete.

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.

Character, Design and Heritage

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 28 of the HDPF relates to house extensions and outbuildings in the countryside, stating that extensions should not be disproportionate to the size of the existing dwelling, and should be in keeping with the scale and character of the existing dwelling. The policy also states that the cumulative impact of existing extensions will be taken into account.

Policy 34 of the HDPF seeks to sustain and enhance heritage assets and requires development affecting a heritage asset to have regard to its significance, including its character, appearance and historic interest.

Policies RNP6, RNP7, RNP8 and RNP9 of the Rudgwick Neighbourhood Plan are also relevant and seek, amongst other matters, to ensure that development responds appropriately to local materials, architectural style, building height and the character of the street scene. These policies form part of the development plan applicable to the proposal.

The NPPF 2026 identifies heritage assets as an irreplaceable resource. Policy HE4 requires heritage assets to be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance and seeks to avoid harm to their significance. Where harm cannot be avoided or minimised, clear and convincing justification is required. Policy HE5 requires the effects of proposals on heritage assets to be assessed by reference to the significance of the asset and the effect of the works upon that significance. Policy HE6 applies to designated heritage assets and requires considerable importance and weight to be given to any harm to their significance.

Ivy Cottage is a Grade II listed building comprising a small C17 or earlier timber-framed cottage with later additions. Its principal significance derives from the surviving historic timber-framed core, its traditional form and fabric, and its relationship with the surrounding rural setting. The later post-war additions are of lesser significance and are visually and architecturally distinct from the historic core.

The proposed works include extensions and alterations to the later elements of the building, which is not of any particular significance. While of an appreciable overall scale the proposed design would ensure the historic core remains clearly legible and retains its primacy. In respect of the proposed dormers, they represent sizeable additions to the roof and are not particularly reflective of the host building. The design and materiality would though provide some visual relief such that they are not considered harmful to the principle listed building.

In the context of the existing arrangement and built form on the site it is not considered that the extensions would appear harmfully disproportionate, with the resulting building continuing to be well contained within the spacious site boundaries.

The proposals would not result in harm, preserving the special architectural and historic interest and significance of Ivy Cottage. There would similarly be no adverse impacts on the prevailing character or appearance of the wider surrounding area, with the site well screened from wider public view. The proposal therefore accords 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.

Ivy Cottage occupies a relatively spacious rural plot surrounded predominantly by agricultural land and open countryside. Having regard to the location of the proposed works within the site, their predominantly single-storey form, their scale and their relationship with surrounding properties, the development would not give rise to an unacceptable loss of privacy, outlook or daylight, nor would it result in an overbearing impact upon neighbouring occupiers. The amenity impacts of the proposal are therefore considered acceptable in terms of residential amenity and in accordance with the above policy.

Ecology and Biodiversity

Policy 31 of the HDPF seeks to maintain and enhance the District's biodiversity and requires development to protect biodiversity and contribute to ecological networks. Policy 25 is also relevant insofar as it seeks to protect the natural environment and landscape character. The NPPF similarly requires planning decisions to contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment, including by protecting habitats and biodiversity. Policies 25 and 31 are identified as relevant development plan policies in this application.

A Preliminary Roost Assessment and Bat Emergence Survey have been submitted in support of the application. The surveys confirm that no bat roosts are present within the building and that the previously removed apple tree was unlikely to have supported roosting bats. No further bat surveys are therefore required.

The site is, however, located within the consultation zones associated with The Mens SAC and Ebernoe Common SAC, which are designated in relation to Barbastelle bats. Habitats within and around the site have the potential to contribute to local bat foraging and commuting routes. The loss of a tree and hedgerow could consequently affect habitat connectivity. A condition is recommended to secure a Biodiversity Compensation and Enhancement Strategy, and this would provide a means of securing suitable replacement planting / compensation.

On the basis of the above the proposal is considered to accord with the above policies.

Water Neutrality

There is no clear or compelling evidence to suggest that 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 effect 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 therefore not adversely affect the integrity of these sites and would accord with the relevant provisions of the NPPF (2026) and the Council's obligations under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

Biodiversity Net Gain

The proposed development is the subject of a householder application and is therefore exempt from the statutory biodiversity gain condition pursuant to the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024. Accordingly, there is no requirement for the development to achieve the statutory 10% biodiversity net gain.

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 **Pre-commencement Condition:** No relevant works shall commence until the following details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The works must not be executed other than in complete accordance with these approved details:

- a) Drawings to a scale not smaller than 1:5 fully describing roof details including sections through:
 - flat roof perimeters;
 - junction between dormer cheeks and pitched roof verge.
- b) Drawings to a scale not smaller than 1:20 showing internal drainage routes for new bathroom in historically significant cottage, noting all necessary cutting, chasing and other alteration to historic fabric.

Reason: As this matter is fundamental to ensure that the significance of the designated heritage asset, and the character, appearance and integrity of the building, is not prejudiced, thereby preserving the special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, and to comply with Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 4 **Pre-commencement (Slab Level) Condition:** No development above ground floor slab level shall take place until a Biodiversity Compensation and Enhancement Strategy, in line with the recommendations of the Preliminary Roost Assessment Rev 02 (Lizard Landscape Design and Ecology, August 2026) and to compensate for the loss of one tree and a hedgerow, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The content of the Biodiversity Compensation and Enhancement Strategy shall include the following:

- a) Purpose and conservation objectives for the proposed compensation for the loss of a tree and a hedgerow and enhancement measures;
- b) detailed designs or product descriptions to achieve stated objectives;
- c) locations, orientations and heights of proposed compensation and enhancement measures by appropriate maps and plans (where relevant);
- d) persons responsible for implementing the compensation and enhancement measures; and
- e) details of initial aftercare and long-term maintenance (where relevant).

The strategy shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained in that manner thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the protection, conservation and enhancement of biodiversity, priority habitats and protected species, and to enable the Local Planning Authority to discharge its duties under Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (as amended) and the biodiversity policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (August 2026).

- 5 **Regulatory Condition:** All mitigation measures and/or works shall be carried out in accordance with the details contained in the Bat Emergence Survey Report (Lizard Landscape Design and Ecology, July 2026) and Preliminary Roost Assessment Rev 02 (Lizard Landscape Design and Ecology, August 2026).

Reason: To conserve protected and Priority species and allow the LPA to discharge its duties under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations and in accordance with Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

- 6 **Regulatory Condition:** The materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall strictly accord with those indicated on the application form and approved plans.

Reason: To ensure that the significance of the designated heritage asset, and the character, appearance and integrity of the building, is not prejudiced, thereby preserving the special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, and to comply with Policy 34 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/26/0685

(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
Location & Block plan	Block and Location Plan	3.00	28.04.2026
Floor plan	Proposed Ground Floor plan	3.01 REV A	28.04.2026
Floor plan	Proposed First Floor Plan	3.02 REV A	28.04.2026
Roof plan	Proposed Roof Plan	3.03 REV A	28.04.2026
Elevation plan	Proposed Elevations	3.04 REV A	28.04.2026
Plans	Topographical Survey	1.01	28.04.2026
Floor plan	Existing Ground Floor Plan	1.02	28.04.2026
Floor plan	Existing First Floor Plan	1.03	28.04.2026
Roof plan	Existing Roof Plan	1.04	28.04.2026
Elevation plan	North and South Existing Elevations	1.05	28.04.2026

