



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/26/0456

19 Billingshurst Road, Broadbridge Heath, West Sussex, RH12 3LB

DESCRIPTION:

Erection of a single storey rear extension, ground floor infill extension, and first floor infill extension.
Installation of dormer windows to the front and rear elevations.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/25/0208	Partial demolition of existing rear structures and erection of a two storey rear extension with extension of the existing rear roof and new dormer window to the front elevation.	Application 04.08.2025	Refused	on
DC/25/1761	Partial demolition of existing rear structures and erection of a two storey rear extension with extension of the existing rear roof and new dormer window to the front elevation.	Application 23.12.2025	Refused	on

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

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

Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity

Policy 19: Development Quality

Policy 20: Development Principles

Neighbourhood Plan:

Broadbridge Heath has not been designated as a Neighbourhood Plan area. There is no 'made' plan for the parish.

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:

Southern Water: Advice / Informative

Parish Comments:

Broadbridge Heath Parish Council: Objection

'Broadbridge Heath Parish Council is objecting to the above planning application on the grounds of overdevelopment of the site and a design that is out of character with both the local area and the original architectural style of the existing building.

While we acknowledge that the proposal is for a single-storey extension and that the design incorporates a "crinkle crankle" wall in an attempt to reduce the perceived massing of the structure, we remain of the view that the proposed development extends a considerable distance into the rear garden. In doing so, it appears overly dominant and would significantly and adversely alter the character and openness of the rear gardens within the terrace as a whole.

In addition, we consider the scale and positioning of the proposed development to be potentially impractical in the context of the site and its relationship with adjoining properties.

We also wish to highlight concerns regarding construction impact if approved. It is understood that all building materials, equipment, and machinery would need to be brought onto the site via number 17. Given the proximity of the access gate to the dwelling, this would likely result in substantial disruption to the occupiers of that property over the duration of the works.'

Representations:

1 letter of representation received supporting the application. No specific comments provided relating to the merits of the application.

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:

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 comprises a mid-terrace two-storey dwelling on the southern side of Billingshurst Road. The terrace row is of modest proportions, two storey red brick and clay tiled pitched roof houses with later additions and has an attractive appearance befitting its age. The dwellings have rectangular plots which extend to the south (approx. 27 metres) and provide spacious rear garden space. At the end of the rear of garden space are outbuildings and some mature trees which provide a degree of screening from properties to the south. Neighbouring attached dwelling No.21 has previously been extended to the side with 2 storeys.

The site has been subject of two previous planning applications (DC/25/1761 and DC/25/0208) which were refused on the grounds of the design, form and scale of the proposed two-storey rear extension and dormer. Specifically, concerns were raised regarding the effect the development would have on the

roofslope of the building, where the design and form of each proposal was considered would cumulatively over-dominate the rear elevation and roof slope with a significant additional mass that were considered to be of a design, form and scale that would be inappropriate to the character and appearance of the host building/terrace row, and which would harm the character and appearance of the wider area by forming a poor and visually unsightly contrast with both the host dwelling and the remainder of the terrace row, and would represent an unduly dominant and intrusive addition.

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single-storey rear infill extension with mono-pitch roof, with a single-storey rear flat-roofed extension to a height of 2.75 metres, linking to a further single storey flat-roofed rear extension to a maximum height of 3.2 metres. Light buff grey fibre cement panel finish to the rear link extension with vertical larch cladding to the further rear extension. Also proposed is a first-floor rear infill flat roofed extension, and flat roofed rear roof dormer window. Fenestration proposed to the rear elevations are dark powder coated aluminium window frames and glazed dark powder coated doors.

To the front elevation roof-slope a roof dormer window is proposed with pitched roofing, to match width of existing front facing first floor window.

The proposed rear extensions although single-storey are of a scale and height that would add significant additional development and mass extending into the rear garden, such that it is considered that the layout and form of which would appear out of context with the row of terraces. The development scale and form extending into the rear amenity area would also thus add an overbearing development to neighbouring dwellings to both sides. The proposal would add a significant footprint increase and development to the rear of the terrace row of dwellings of modest proportions. It is considered that the rear extension although single storey would appear a visually incongruous development reducing the openness of the rear gardens within the terrace as a whole and in the context of the site and its relationship with adjoining properties.

The proposed front roof dormer would introduce a feature not currently present on the terrace row. It is though considered a modest dormer window of the siting and design proposed would not as a matter of course appear incongruous. The rear roof dormer although flat roofed would have limited visibility from the public realm and in itself is acceptable in principle.

The proposal overall would introduce an incongruous rear development at the rear of the terrace row considered to be of a form, layout and scale that is not acceptable in this case to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and wider area. It is therefore considered that the visual impact of the proposal is not supportable for approval and would not compliant with the policy 32 of the HDPF.

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 proposal would not create any views of adjoining properties which would be unusual or unexpected in an established residential location such as this and no harmful loss of privacy would arise. However, while the rear extension would be single-storey it would be of a scale and height visible from the rear of adjoining properties and would have an overbearing impact on neighbouring amenity which is not considered in this case to be compliant with policy 33 of the HDPF.

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 Refused

Reason for Refusal:

- 1 The proposed rear extension, by virtue of its form, layout and scale would appear out of context to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and wider area, which would appear as an incongruous addition to the host dwelling and this row of terraced dwellings, and would read as a visually discordant extension which would not respect the form or proportions of the existing dwelling at odds with the prevailing pattern of development and character of the area. In addition, the rear extension would be of an overt scale and height visible from the rear of adjoining properties and would introduce an overbearing impact on neighbouring amenity. The proposal therefore does not accord with the provisions of 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/26/0456

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

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Location plan		BR 2602 PL. 001	13.03.2026
Site plan	EXISTING	BR.2602 PL. 002	13.03.2026
Roof plan	EXISTING	BR.2602 PL. 003	13.03.2026
Floor plan	EXISTING GROUND	BR.2602 PL. 004	13.03.2026
Floor plan	EXISTING FIRST	BR.2602 PL. 005	13.03.2026
Elevation plan	EXISTING FRONT NORTH FACING	BR.2602 PL. 006	13.03.2026
Elevation plan	EXISTING REAR SOUTH FACING	BR.2602 PL. 007	13.03.2026
Section plan	EXISTING A-A	BR.2602 PL. 008	13.03.2026
Elevation plan	EXISTING EAST FACING ELEVATION	BR.2602 PL. 009	13.03.2026
Elevation plan	EXISTING WEST FACING ELEVATION	BR.2602 PL. 010	13.03.2026

Roof plan	EXISTING ROOF AND SITE	BR.2602 PL. 011	13.03.2026
Roof plan	PROPOSED ROOF AND SITE PLAN	BR.2602 PL. 012	13.03.2026
Floor plan	PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PART PLAN	BR.2602 PL. 013	13.03.2026
Floor plan	PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN OF SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION	BR.2602 PL. 014	13.03.2026
Floor plan	PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLAN	BR.2602 PL. 015	13.03.2026
Roof plan	PROPOSED	BR.2602 PL. 016	13.03.2026
Floor plan	PROPOSED 2ND FLOOR LOFT PLAN	BR.2602 PL. 017	13.03.2026
Roof plan	PROPOSED	BR.2602 PL. 018	13.03.2026
Section plan	PROPOSED SECTION A-A (PART SECTION)	BR.2602 PL. 019	13.03.2026
Section plan	PROPOSED SECTION A-A (PART SECTION) NEAR REAR EXTENSION	BR.2602 PL. 020	13.03.2026
Elevation plan	PROPOSED FRONT FACING NORTH ELEVATION	BR.2602 PL. 021	13.03.2026
Section plan	PROPOSED SECTION B-B AND REAR ELEVATION	BR.2602 PL. 022	13.03.2026
Section plan	PROPOSED SECTION C-C AND ELEVATION TO NEW EXTENSION AND REAR	BR.2602 PL. 023	13.03.2026
Elevation plan	PROPOSED WEST ELEVATION OF REAR EXTENSION	BR.2602 PL. 024	13.03.2026
Elevation plan	PROPOSED WEST FACING ELEVATION	BR.2602 PL. 025	13.03.2026
Elevation plan	PROPOSED EAST ELEVATION	BR.2602 PL. 026	13.03.2026

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Steve Astles Date: 05.05.2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial RHERMITAGE Date: 08.05.2026