



**DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET**

| <b>OFFICER CHECKLIST</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                    |                                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>WEEK ONE (Date Valid)</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                | <b>16th March 2026</b>              |
| Check Neighbours                                                                                                                                                                                                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Check Consultations (including newts) / Press List                                                                                                                                                                          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Check Description, Plans and Supporting Documents                                                                                                                                                                           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Print and Display Site Notice (if required)                                                                                                                                                                                 | -                                   |
| <b>WEEK TWO (+7)</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                        | <b>23rd March 2026</b>              |
| Visit Site or request site visit photos (in accordance with Site Visit Guidance Note)                                                                                                                                       | -                                   |
| Draft HRA / AA if necessary. If the water statement is insufficient discuss with TL / PPO whether to discuss / accept amendments to the strategy.                                                                           | -                                   |
| Instruct Legal if s106 required (with prior TL / PPO agreement)                                                                                                                                                             | -                                   |
| <b>WEEK THREE (+14)</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                     | <b>30th March 2026</b>              |
| If amendments are likely to be needed discuss with TL / PPO (N.B. Only minor amendments will be accepted in accordance with the Amendment Guidance). When requesting amendments give clear deadline (i.e. start of week 5). | -                                   |
| <b>WEEK FOUR (+21)</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                      | <b>6th April 2026</b>               |
| If no amendments required, contact agent / applicant with update on progress.                                                                                                                                               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Confirm whether delegated or committee decision (re: parish and neighbour representations)                                                                                                                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>WEEK FIVE (+28)</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                      | <b>13th April 2026</b>              |
| 14-day re-consultation letters to be sent on any amended plans                                                                                                                                                              | -                                   |
| Prepare draft report                                                                                                                                                                                                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>WEEK SIX (+35)</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                       | <b>20th April 2026</b>              |
| Check 35-day Cllr call-in for Committee                                                                                                                                                                                     | -                                   |
| If decision based on original plans, report to be drafted and submitted for sign off                                                                                                                                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>WEEK SEVEN (+42)</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                     | <b>27th April 2026</b>              |
| If decision based on amended plans, report to be drafted and submitted for sign off                                                                                                                                         | -                                   |
| Reason for EOT                                                                                                                                                                                                              | -                                   |

**APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:**

DC/26/0463  
10 Cook Way, Broadbridge Heath, West Sussex, RH12 3US

**DESCRIPTION:**

Erection of a single storey rear extension, first floor rear extension and change of front window to juliet balcony, and retention of part conversion of existing garage for the use of habitable living space.

**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

Policy 41 – Parking

#### **Broadbridge Heath neighbourhood planning**

Broadbridge Heath has not been designated as a Neighbourhood Plan area.

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

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](http://www.horsham.gov.uk).

### Consultations:

#### Parish Comments:

Broadbridge Heath Parish Council has no specific concerns regarding the application. However, it notes that the proposed Juliet balcony on the front elevation represents a departure from the original design intention of the property. Given the location and layout of the property, there are no objections, provided that no material objections are raised by adjacent occupiers.

### Southern Water:

No objection.

### WSCC Highways:

The Highway Authority raises no objection to the proposal. They note that the site is accessed via a private road and that the existing garage is substandard in size and does not contribute to parking provision. As the proposals do not introduce additional bedrooms, no material increase in traffic or parking demand is anticipated. Sufficient parking is considered available within the surrounding area, and the development is not expected to result in any adverse impact on highway safety.

### Representations:

X1 representation has been received, supporting the application for the following reasons: -

- Considers the proposal to be modest, appropriate, and in keeping with the character of the area, with no harm to amenity, privacy, parking, or the street scene.
- The extension is not expected to result in overlooking, loss of privacy, or overshadowing of neighbouring properties.
- The works are intended to support the care needs of a family member, which the neighbour considers reasonable and necessary, and they respectfully request that the application be approved.

## 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 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 is located at 10 Cook Way, Broadbridge Heath, within an established residential area characterised by detached dwellings set within spacious plots. The property occupies a prominent position within the street and is bounded by neighbouring residential properties, with the Broadbridge Heath Bypass located to the south.

The rear extensions are of a scale and form that remain subordinate to the host dwelling. Their design reflects the existing building's proportions and roof forms, ensuring they integrate successfully with the original structure. The replacement of a front-facing window with a Juliet balcony would result in only a minor alteration to the front elevation and would not significantly alter the overall appearance of the dwelling or disrupt the rhythm of the street scene.

The proposed materials are intended to match the existing dwelling, including the use of similar brickwork, roof tiles, and fenestration detailing. As such, the development would appear visually cohesive with the host property and would not result in an incongruous or visually dominant feature within the street scene or wider area.

During the application process, it became apparent that the garage had been partly converted to a habitable living space. An amended description to include the garage conversion element was agreed. The retention of the converted garage would not result in any adverse impact on the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area, as the alteration is largely internal in nature and does not materially alter the external appearance of the building.

The proposal would be a clearly subservient addition and 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.

Due to their siting, scale, and orientation, the development would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, overlooking, or overshadowing to adjacent properties.

The introduction of a Juliet balcony to the front elevation would not give rise to overlooking issues, as it does not involve the creation of an external platform and faces onto the public street. The retained garage conversion would not give rise to any issues of overlooking, overbearing impact, or loss of light to adjoining properties. The use remains ancillary and residential in character.

It is considered that the siting and layout of the proposed extensions, and retention of the converted garage and the resulting relationship with neighbouring properties would be sufficient to prevent any unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity. Overall, the proposal is not considered to cause harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

### **Impact on Parking**

Policy 41 of the HDPF states that development which involves the loss of existing parking spaces will only be allowed if suitable alternative provision has been secured elsewhere, or the need for the development overrides the loss of parking and where necessary measures are in place to mitigate against the impact.

WSCC Highways raises no objection to the proposal and confirms that it would not result in a material increase in vehicular movements, with no changes proposed to the existing access.

Whilst the proposal involves the loss of the existing garage, it is noted that this space is substandard in size and does not contribute to the parking provision for the dwelling. Therefore, the loss of the garage for parking cannot be justifiably rejected on the grounds of parking provision alone. The Local Highways Authority recognise that parking is available within the wider Cook Way, and it is noted that the development also does not introduce any additional bedrooms and therefore would not increase parking demand. In accordance with the West Sussex County Council Parking Demand Calculator, a dwelling of this size would generate a requirement of 2.7 off-street parking spaces. It is also noted, as advised by the agent, that a remaining portion of the garage (measuring approximately 3.1m x 5m) could accommodate a small vehicle if required.

Although there are no formally allocated parking spaces for the property, it is noted that there are two informal parking spaces located adjacent to the dwelling, which the current occupiers have been using on a regular basis. No objections have been raised by neighbouring properties or WSCC Highways in relation to this longstanding arrangement.

On balance, given the existing parking arrangement and the lack of increased demand, the proposal would not adversely impact parking provision or highway safety. The development is therefore considered acceptable in highway and parking terms.

### **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 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/26/0463**

(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 |
|----------------|----------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Block plan     | Block Plans          | 917/02         | 16.03.2026    |
| Location plan  | Location Plans       | 917/01         | 16.03.2026    |
| Floor plan     | Existing Floor Plans | 917/03.1       | 16.03.2026    |
| Floor plan     | Existing Floor Plans | 917/03.2       | 16.03.2026    |
| Elevation plan | Existing Elevations  | 917/04         | 16.03.2026    |
| Floor plan     | Proposed Floor Plans | 917/05.1       | 16.03.2026    |
| Floor plan     | Proposed Floor Plans | 917/05.2       | 16.03.2026    |
| Elevation plan | Proposed Elevations  | 917/07         | 16.03.2026    |

## **DELEGATED**

Case Officer sign/initial      Meg Bayliss      Date: 04/06/2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial      Tamara Dale      Date: 09/06/2026