DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:
DC/25/0077
17 Millfield, Southwater, West Sussex, RH13 9HT

DESCRIPTION:
Erection of a first floor side extension over existing ground floor and a single storey rear extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/23/1592	Conversion of garage into habitable living space.	Application Permitted on 05.10.2023

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

Southwater Neighbourhood Development Plan 2018-2031
SNP14 – Adequate Provision of Car Parking
SNP16 – Design

Southwater Parish Design Statement

Horsham District Local Plan (2023-40) (Regulation 19):
Policy 9: Water Neutrality
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:
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, due to insufficient parking whilst adding habitable living space, which is contrary to Southwater Neighbourhood Plan policies SNP14.1 and SNP14.2

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.

Policy SNP16 of the Southwater Neighbourhood Plan states that all development must be of high quality design. This means facing buildings with locally sourced materials, or materials equivalent to those that would historically have been sourced locally wherever possible; encourage a variety of complementary vernaculars to encourage contextually appropriate design and diversity in our building stock; and making sure the design of new development actively responds to other properties in the vicinity.

The side extension would reflect the front and rear building lines and roof form of the host building. While this approach would not create a subservient appearance it is considered that no visual harm would result from this arrangement. There are examples of similar extensions to other semi-detached pairs within the street scene. This arrangement is an established part of the street scene and has not resulted in visually harmful imbalances with pairs of properties. The extension would result in some loss of openness between the extended host building and neighbour, but the remaining separation is considered sufficient and in keeping with the prevailing pattern of development in the locality.

The proposal 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.

The northern neighbour features ground and first floor window openings to the flank elevation fronting the application site. These openings, based on their configuration and historical planning applications (i.e. HR/74/73) do not relate to primary habitable rooms, with the key light and outlook to this neighbouring property considered to derive from the front and rear elevations of the building. These elevations would not be impacted by the proposed extension and taking into account the retained separation any loss of light or outlook to side facing windows would not be considered to result in unacceptable harm to amenity.

The proposal would not create any views of neighbouring properties or land which would be unusual or unexpected in a residential location such as this, and no harmful loss of privacy would result from the scheme.

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, in accordance with the above policy.

Impact on Parking Provision

Policy SNP14 of the NP states that where proposals would result in the creation of additional bedrooms it should also include increases in parking spaces within the curtilage of the dwelling to the same level as if it were a new dwelling, unless this is not practically possible.

The proposal would create an additional bedroom, increasing the property from a three-bed to a four-bed dwelling. West Sussex County Council's 'Guidance on Parking at New Developments' indicates that the number of spaces for a five-bedroom dwelling would be the same as a four-bedroom dwelling, at 2.7 spaces. While the existing site layout provides 2 on-site parking spaces (and a shortfall of 1 space) the proposal would not materially alter the level or nature of this shortfall. There is no evidence to suggest the existing arrangement results in a harmful level of displaced parking, with no indication that street parking adversely impacts on the highway network, highway safety or neighbouring amenity.

On this basis it is considered that any conflict with the above policy would not amount to a level of harm which would warrant a refusal of planning permission. The impacts of the proposal in respect of parking provision are therefore considered acceptable.

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 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/25/0077
(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
Elevation & Floor plan	Existing	750.24 / 02 REV A	20.01.2025
Elevation & Floor plan	Proposed	750.24 / 03 REV A	20.01.2025
Section plan	C-C	750.24 / 06 REV A1	28.01.2025
Block plan		750.24 / 08 REV A	20.01.2025
Location plan		750.24 / 01 REV A1	28.01.2025

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Marie Riggs Date: 24.03.2025

Authorising Officer sign/initial Guy Everest Date: 25.03.2025