Horsham District Council

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:
DC/25/0208
19 Billingshurst Road, Broadbridge Heath, West Sussex, RH12 3LB

DESCRIPTION:
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.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
None

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 9: Water Neutrality
Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
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.

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:
Object, for the following reasons: -

- Concerns of over-development of the site considering both current layout and the inherent limitations of the site, for example mid terrace and the angled rear garden.

- Although the effect on both adjoining properties has been considered in the Design Statement it is not clear if these are deemed to be satisfactory or acceptable to the owners of the adjoining properties.

- Whilst the intent of the applicant is recognised along with the desire to modernise, the location and layout do not easily lend themselves to such a development as proposed.

- It would be helpful to have a construction brief should the application be successful and confirmation of acceptance from the owners of the adjoining properties of the proposed development, including future maintenance and upkeep of the property if developed, given the proposed layout of the rear elevation.

- Although introducing a new front dormer the front elevation appears to be acceptable as proposed.

- Concerns surrounding accessibility for construction and impact on neighbouring properties were also raised.

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:

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 and, despite later additions, has an attractive appearance befitting its age. The terrace features rear gabled projections of single and two-storey height.

The proposal entails a substantial two-storey rear extension which would project beyond the rear of the existing (and adjoining) outrigger. It is considered that the scale, form and design of the extension

would create a poor and visually unsightly contrast with both the host building and the remainder of the terrace row. The extension would represent an unduly dominant and intrusive addition, which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building, terrace row and wider surrounds. It is considered that there is likely to be limited potential for a two-storey development of the scale proposed at this site.

The scale of the rear extension would provide some screening (in views from ground level) of the proposed rear dormer. However, this extension would dominate the rear roofslope of the building, creating the appearance of a third storey as opposed to a subservient roof extension. It is acknowledged that the dwelling would benefit from permitted development rights for roof extensions, these rights would not though allow a dormer of the external materials being proposed.

The proposal to the rear of the property would introduce significant additional mass to the rear considered to be of a design, form and scale which would be inappropriate to the character and appearance of the host building / terrace row, and which would harm the character or appearance of the wider area. It is therefore considered that the visual impact of the proposal is not acceptable and would accord with the above policies.

The front 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. As such there is no fundamental concern in respect of this element of the proposal.

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.

While the rear extensions would be clearly visible from the rear of adjoining properties, and there are concerns that it would appear visually overbearing, its siting in relation to adjoining structures and window openings would largely mitigate any unacceptable impact on light and outlook. The proposal would similarly 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.

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 180 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 rear extensions by reason of their scale, form and design would represent discordant, unduly dominant and incongruous additions which would be inappropriate to the character and appearance of the host building / terrace row, and which would harm the character or appearance of the wider area. It is therefore considered that the visual impact of the proposal is not acceptable and would be contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Framework (2015). While there are less concerns in respect of the front dormer and impact on neighbouring amenity, these represent neutral

considerations which would not outweigh the harm identified above. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reasons:

1 The rear extensions by reason of their scale, form and design would represent discordant, unduly dominant and incongruous additions which would be inappropriate to the character and appearance of the host building / terrace row, and which would harm the character or appearance of the wider area. It is therefore considered that the visual impact of the proposal is not acceptable and would be contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Framework (2015).

Plans list for: DC/25/0208
Schedule of plans/documents **not approved**:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Elevation plan	Proposed Rear	TMS.2404.PL.016	11.02.2025
Elevation plan	Proposed Side	TMS.2404.PL.016	11.02.2025
Elevation plan	Proposed Side	TMS.2404.PL.018	11.02.2025
Supporting Statement	Design	NONE	11.02.2025
Elevation plan	Existing West	TMS.2404.PL.019	24.02.2025
Elevation plan	Existing East	TMS.2404.PL.020	24.02.2025
Site plan	Proposed	TMS.2404.PL.021	24.02.2025
Location plan		TMS.2404.PL.001	11.02.2025
Site plan	Existing	TMS.2404.PL.002	11.02.2025
Roof plan	Existing	TMS.2404.PL.003	11.02.2025
Floor plan	Existing Ground	TMS.2404.PL.004	11.02.2025
Floor plan	Existing First	TMS.2404.PL.005	11.02.2025
Elevation plan	Existing Front	TMS.2404.PL.006	11.02.2025
Elevation plan	Existing Rear	TMS.2404.PL.001	11.02.2025
Section plan	Existing	TMS.2404.PL.008	11.02.2025
Roof plan	Proposed	TMS.2404.PL.009	11.02.2025
Floor plan	Proposed Ground	TMS.2404.PL.010	11.02.2025
Floor plan	Proposed First	TMS.2404.PL.011	11.02.2025
Floor plan	Proposed Loft	TMS.2404.PL.012	11.02.2025
Roof plan	Proposed	TMS.2404.PL.013	11.02.2025
Section plan	Proposed	TMS.2404.PL.014	11.02.2025
Elevation plan	Proposed Front	TMS.2404.PL.015	11.02.2025

DELEGATED

Authorising Officer sign/initial Guy Everest Date: 01.08.2025