Horsham District Council

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:
DC/24/1307
Copper Beeches, Upper Station Road, Henfield, West Sussex, BN5 9PL

DESCRIPTION:
Erection of a two storey rear extension, enlargement of the eastern most roof, addition of a front facing dormer, and addition of two new rooflights.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

HF/8/77	4 private garages and vehicualr access. (From old Planning History)	Application 23.03.1977	Permitted	on
HF/74/76	4 garages. (From old Planning History)	Application 08.02.1977	Refused	on
HF/68/76	Erection of house and vehicular and pedestrian access. Comment: Minor ammendment 15/03/77 (From old Planning History)	Application 06.01.1977	Permitted	on
HF/65/65	Site for bungalow and garage. (From old Planning History)	Application 08.12.1965	Refused	on
HF/32/74	House and garage. (From old Planning History)	Application 31.07.1974	Permitted	on
HF/18/73	Erection of house of chalet bungalow. Comment: Outline. (From old Planning History)	Application 02.03.1973	Permitted	on

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

Henfield Neighbourhood Plan (HNP) 2017 - 2031:
Policy 12 - Design Standards for New Development

Henfield Parish Design Statement

REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS RESPONSES

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:
No objection

Representations:
8 letters of representation received from 5 addresses (two of which were received from addresses outside of the District) *objecting* to the proposal on the following grounds:

- Loss of light to neighbouring properties
- Uncharacteristic design and form
- Impact on neighbouring house prices
- Enclosure of neighbouring patio
- Increased light pollution
- The proposal extends beyond the rear building line
- The proposed plans are misleading
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- Loss of views from neighbouring balcony

5 letters of representation received from 2 addresses *neither objecting to nor supporting* the proposal, noting the following:

- Right to light document inaccurate as the extension is two storey and not single
- Proposal of this scale would dominate landscape
- Loss of privacy
- Increased light pollution
- Single storey addition would be more appropriate
- Unable to properly view the plans on the website
- There is a covenant on the 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 proposed development is for erection of a two storey rear extension, enlargement of the eastern most roof, addition of a front facing dormer, and addition of two new rooflights at Copper Beeches Upper Station Road Henfield. Cooper Beeches is a detached, two story dwelling set back from Upper Station Road, Henfield by a modest driveway. The surrounding build of the area is mixed, with their being loose architectural cohesion between dwellings on Upper Station Road however, there are dwellings that are of interest.

The application has been assessed on the basis of the submitted details, together with the planning history of the site, available images and photographs, and a site visit conducted by the Officer. These details were considered sufficient to allow the application to be properly considered and determined.

Character and Appearance

Policy 32 and 33 of the HDPF seeks 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 12 of the HNP advocates for new development be of sound design and reflective of the character of the area. It aims to protect against inappropriate development by ensuring the design, scale, layout and massing of development is appropriate to the immediate area. Development should be respectful to the conservation area and listed buildings if applicable.

The proposed development is for erection of a two storey rear extension, enlargement of the eastern most roof, addition of a front facing dormer, replacement of the existing flat roofed rear dormer with a pitched roof dormer, and addition of two new rooflights to the side roofslopes.

The rear extension emulates the same design of the current house and is considered to be of an acceptable design that neatly integrates with the existing dwelling. The extension comprises an additional 4.5m to the rear. To the east, the roof is enlarged with an additional roof dormer to the front elevation. This matches the half hip profile to the rear of the property and again is judged to be a suitable design. The rear dormer is proposed to match the style of the new front dormer, both with pitched roofs and would sit more comfortably within the roofslope with a more appropriate design. An open face porch at the front elevation serving the front door is also proposed.

While large, the extension would be accommodated on a generous plot that would be capable of hosting an extension of this scale, which would not appear at odds within its setting- Officers note that a number of properties within the vicinity comprise similarly sized generous plots with similar levels of built-form. Though the proposed would be two storeys in height, the overall design of the additions would not adversely contract against the existing character or design of the dwelling as existing. The proposal is therefore 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(2) 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.

It is not considered that the additions appreciably harm the surrounding neighbouring amenity in terms of overlooking. The extensions are relatively brief and new vantage points are similar to the existing arrangement barring the front facing dormer which is not considered to have a detrimental impact (owing to its distance to neighbouring properties to the south). Sufficient distance would be retained between the existing dwelling and neighbours to the rear (in excess of 55m). No neighbouring amenity impact is envisioned from the porch or rooflight additions.

The neighbouring concerns relating to overshadowing and overbearing are noted by Officers. The applicant has provided a plan illustrating that the proposed extension would not intersect a 45degree line from the neighbouring window at Fairlawns. The ground floor of the neighbouring property's rear elevation closest to the site comprises a canted bay window. The to the first floor the rear elevations comprises two single slim sliding sash windows and a door to the balcony. Another similarly sized window it sited to the side elevation of the neighbouring property which faces the existing roof of the site. Plans from the neighbouring site's application HF/57/85 illustrate that these windows serve a dining room (ground floor) and bedroom (first floor) respectively.

The Council's Design Guidance Leaflet No. 1 (2008) sets out the 'general rules of thumb' in establishing light and outlook impact from neighbouring extensions. Figure 7 (acceptable two storey or first floor extensions to a detached property) is most relevant in this case. The figure illustrates that a 45 degree line should be taken from the neighbouring window's centre point. The applicants plan illustrates that at the ground floor level, this would be achieved without intersecting the 45degree line when taken from the central window within the canted bay.

To the first floor, a 45degree line has been taken some 2.85m from the side elevation of the neighbour- though the windows are not shown on the plan, utilising the neighbouring plans from the 1985 permission the line would be taken close to the edge of the further window from the extension. The result is thus one with a minor incursion into the line. However, taking a more accurate line from the midpoint of the nearest window (as per the 1985 plans), this line should instead be taken approximately 1.9m from the side elevation. This results in slightly larger incursion within the line. Whilst this may be the case, this is not considered so significant as to warrant concern in terms of loss of light to the neighbouring window, particularly as the neighbouring bedroom benefits from another window adjacent to the unit where the measurement has been taken from and the door onto the balcony (which is glazed). Though the rear elevations of the dwellings face north, thus already experiencing a natural level of diminished light intake, the proposed extension is not expected to severely exacerbate this arrangement, especially when considering the ridge of the proposed roof is set some 2m lower than the neighbours.

Whilst the neighbour will likely experience some perceived level of impact, owing to the very nature of a change to their boundary, this would not be so harmful to warrant refusal in this instance. With the above in mind, the proposed extension is not considered to result in adverse amenity harm by way of overshadowing.

Concerns relating to overbearing and the enclosure of the patio within the rear garden of Fairlawns is also noted. Similarly to the above, the neighbour is expected to experience a perceived impact because of the nature of the change adjacent to their boundary. However, this would not be so adverse to warrant concerns on these grounds, especially when considering the width of the patio area and the openness of the neighbouring site when looking north.

Further concerns were also raised with regards to the loss of view from the neighbouring balcony. Given that the views from the balcony that would be lost would be ones directly overlooking the application site's curtilage, the loss of this view is not considered harmful to the neighbour's enjoyment of their property. Conversely, the loss of these views would rather protect the amenity of the applicant's site by restricting rear overlooking into their rear curtilage.

Overall, 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, and the development would therefore accord with Policy 33(2) 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 186 and the Council's obligations under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

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 to be used in the development hereby permitted shall strictly accord with those indicated on the submitted plans and application form unless detail of alternative materials have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to development above ground floor slab level commencing.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail 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/24/1307
Schedule of plans/documents **approved**:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Floor plan	Proposed	AT - 064 - P11 REV A	28.08.2024
Roof plan	Proposed	AT - 064 - P12 REV A	28.08.2024
Elevation plan	Proposed Front and Rear	AT - 064 - P13	28.08.2024
Elevation plan	Proposed Side	AT - 064 - P14 REV A	28.08.2024
Section plan	Proposed A-A	AT - 064 - P15	28.08.2024
Plans	Proposed Front and Rear Visualisations	AT - 064 - P16	28.08.2024
Plans	Proposed Side Visualisations	AT - 064 - P17 REV A	28.08.2024
Location plan		AT - 064 - P01	28.08.2024

Site plan	Existing	AT - 064 - P02	28.08.2024
Floor plan	Existing Ground	AT - 064 - P03	28.08.2024
Floor plan	Existing First	AT - 064 - P04	28.08.2024
Roof plan	Existing	AT - 064 - P05	28.08.2024
Elevation plan	Existing Front and Rear	AT - 064 - P06	28.08.2024
Elevation plan	Existing Side	AT - 064 - P07	28.08.2024
Section plan	Existing A-A	AT - 064 - P08	28.08.2024
Site plan	Proposed	AT - 064 - P09 REV A	28.08.2024
Floor plan	Proposed Ground	AT - 064 - P10	28.08.2024

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial JBurrowes Date: 16/10/2024

Authorising Officer sign/initial RHERMITAGE Date: 18.12.2024