



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/26/0131

Dorlyn House, London Road, Ashington, West Sussex, RH20 3JT

DESCRIPTION:

Conversion of existing 1no. 3-bedroom flat into 2no. 1-bedroom flats, conversion of the loft into habitable living space with the installation of 3no. rooflights, erection of a two storey and single storey rear extension, and alterations to fenestration.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/25/1472

Erection of a single storey and two storey rear extensions, loft conversion with front and rear rooflights, and alteration to fenestration.

Application Permitted on
18.11.2025

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

The site is located within the built-up area of Ashington and is part of a large, detached building containing both residential and commercial uses. The area within the red line boundary comprises a two-storey semi-detached property consisting of 1no. 3-bed maisonette with a separate hair salon business at the front lower level. The site is accessible from London Road and benefits from off-street parking utilised by both the hair salon and the existing dwelling.

There is limited amenity space available on site with the majority covered by hardstanding, thereby limiting the presence of ecological features. The maisonette otherwise benefits from a large roof terrace above an existing rear ground floor extension. The majority of the surrounding development comprises residential dwellings although there are some commercial uses, for example an automobile business to the east.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

The applicant is seeking to convert the existing 3-bedroom flat into two separate dwellings (1no. 1-bed flat and 1no. 3-bed flat) by converting the loft into a habitable space, adding a second storey above the existing rear living space and extending out further with a two-storey rear extension. To facilitate this the applicant is proposing to demolish an existing storage outbuilding which covers most of the rear yard.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):

Policy 1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development

Policy 3 - Strategic Policy: Development Hierarchy

Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection

Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character

Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity

Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33 - Development Principles
Policy 35 - Strategic Policy: Climate Change
Policy 36 - Strategic Policy: Appropriate Energy Use
Policy 37 - Sustainable Construction
Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 - Parking

Ashington Neighbourhood Plan (2021):

Policy ASH3 - Parking

Paragraph 33 of the NPPF requires that all development plans complete their reviews no later than 5 years from their adoption. Horsham District Council is currently in the process of reviewing its development plan however at this stage the emerging policies carry only limited weight in decision making. As the HDPF is now over 5 years old, the most important policies for the determination of this application must be considered as to whether they are 'out of date' (NPPF paragraph 11d). This includes, for applications involving the provision of housing, whether the Council can demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites (NPPF footnote 8).

The Council is currently unable to demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites, with the supply currently calculated as being 1.7 years. The presumption in favour of development within Paragraph 11d) of the NPPF therefore applies in the consideration of all applications for housing development within the District (unless footnote 7 or Paragraph 14 applies to relevant applications), with Policies 2, 4, 15 and 26 now carrying only moderate weight in decision making.

All other policies within the HDPF as itemised above have been assessed against the NPPF and are considered to be consistent such that they continue to attract significant weight in decision making.

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

Strategic Policy 1: Sustainable Development
Strategic Policy 2: Development Hierarchy
Strategic Policy 6: Climate Change
Strategic Policy 7: Appropriate Energy Use
Strategic Policy 8: Sustainable Design and Construction
Strategic Policy 9: Water Neutrality
Strategic Policy 11: Environmental Protection
Strategic Policy 13: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Strategic Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Strategic Policy 19: Development Quality
Strategic Policy 20: Development Principles
Strategic Policy 24: Sustainable Transport
Policy 25: Parking

Supplementary Planning Guidance:

Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD (2017)
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (2017)

Planning Advice Notes:

Shaping Development in Horsham
Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

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:

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

HDC Drainage Engineer: Further Information Required

Further information is required to determine whether the site drainage meets the requirements of the NPPF and PPG, National standards for sustainable drainage systems (June 2025), and the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) – Policy 38.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES**Southern Water:** Comment

If the applicant is planning to utilise the current Wastewater connection Southern Water will have no objections.

WSCC Highways: No Objection

The LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network, therefore is not contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 116), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS:**Representations:**

None received.

Parish Comments:**Ashington Parish Council:** Objection

Ashington Parish Council objects to the proposal on the basis that it provides no increase in parking spaces in an area where parking is already an issue, would represent an overdevelopment of the site and would lead to a loss of light and overlooking to neighbouring properties.

They have also requested that the application is considered against the original building rather than the previous application which has not yet been built out.

Member Comments:

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

The main considerations material to this application relate to:

- The principle of development
- Design and Appearance
- Residential Amenity
- Highways Impacts
- Drainage and Flood Risk

Background

The applicant benefits from extant permission under reference DC/25/1472, hereafter referred to as the 'fallback position', for a similar development to that proposed under this application. The main difference here is that the proposed second storey extension is now larger, extending across the depth of the site rather than finishing at the end of existing roof terrace.

Principle of Development:

Policies 2, 3 and 4 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) (2015) collectively seek to ensure that development is appropriately sited within the district in order to retain its distinctive settlement pattern and rural landscape character. Policy 2 outlines the spatial strategy for the district to 2031, while Policy 3 sets out a series of defined built-up areas where development is accepted in principle, so long as it is appropriate in scale and nature.

The proposal is located within the built-up area of Ashington which is classed as a medium village with a moderate level of services, facilities and community networks, and some public transport. The proposal is for the conversion and extension of an existing 3-bed flat to 2no. flats (1x1-bed and 1x3-bed). This is appropriate in terms of nature and scale to the existing level of development in Ashington and therefore the principle of development in this location is acceptable.

Design and Appearance:

Policy 32 and 33 of the HDPF (2015) require all development in the district to be of a high quality and complementary to locally distinctive character. The policies also seek to ensure that the scale, massing and appearance of new development is appropriate, as well as that a high standard of building materials, finishes and landscaping are used.

Existing development surrounding the proposal is predominantly low-density residential development, with a mix of two-storey dwellings and single storey bungalows. Dwellings are typically situated on plots which allow for large outdoor amenity areas, resulting in gaps between buildings and more open views. There is a lack of cohesiveness in terms of design along London Road with a great deal of variation in the materials used, though development becomes more uniform as you traverse down secondary streets.

The site forms on half of a pair of hip-roofed semi-detached properties. The adjoining southern half of the pair is a restaurant that has extended into the full depth of its rear yard. Whilst these extensions are large, their single storey nature is such that they do not dominate the appearance of the site from Rectory Lane which runs alongside. The application site itself has previously extended at ground and first floor level to the rear.

The proposal will result in a significant increase in scale and massing in comparison to both the existing building and fallback positions which would be visible from both Rectory Lane to the south and Alicia Avenue to the north, due to the low density of surrounding development. The size of the proposal in relation to the net developable area of the site is significant and will likely lead to a cramped, overdeveloped appearance particularly when compared with residential development in the surrounding area. Though the addition of four new windows along the northern elevation and the retention of the existing shed-style roof on the lower storey provide some relief (Nb no such relief is proposed on the southern elevation which would be more readily visible from Rectory Lane), it is considered that the two storey scale and depth of development proposed is inappropriate when compared to the size of the plot as well as in the context of surrounding residential development.

It is therefore concluded that the proposal does not comply with Policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF (2015).

Residential Amenity:

Policy 33(2) of the HDPF (2015) requires development to ensure that it is designed to avoid unacceptable harm to the amenity of occupiers/users of nearby property and land through loss of privacy, outlook, light, noise, or general disturbance. Similarly, Paragraph 198 of the NPPF requires development to be appropriate for its location and avoid impacts upon living conditions.

Loss of Privacy, Outlook and Light

The application seeks to extend an existing residential property by approximately 6m at the rear as well as the addition of a full second storey and a loft conversion, in order to create an additional dwelling. The proposal would be a significant addition to the existing building in terms of scale and massing, which has the potential to result in a loss of privacy, outlook and light at neighbouring properties. There are three neighbouring residential properties: The Old Butchers Shop, 3 Alicia Avenue and a flat above the adjacent Indian restaurant.

The Old Butchers Shop is located to the rear of the proposal and sits perpendicular to its rear elevation. There are no windows on the side elevation facing the proposal, though there is an access door at ground level leading out to the amenity space. The proposed extension would project out to within 1m of the site boundary at its closest point which could result in the development becoming overbearing – particularly at two storeys. Following a site visit it was concluded that as there are no windows on the side elevation facing the proposal there is unlikely to be a significant loss of light or loss of privacy, particularly as no windows are proposed on the rear elevation of the proposal. In addition, the orientation and siting of The Old Butchers Shop is such that the works are unlikely to feel overbearing to occupants using the private amenity space. It is therefore concluded that occupants of The Old Butchers Shop are unlikely to suffer significant loss of amenity.

The flat above the Indian restaurant adjoins the proposal on its upper southern elevation and has three windows at its rear, facing out towards the proposed extension. No windows are proposed on the southern elevation and the works would facilitate the removal of a sun terrace with direct views to the flat, likely resulting in a betterment in terms of privacy. The proposal would protrude beyond the 45-degree line from all three windows and therefore could have an overbearing impact on or over-dominate the outlook from the flat. It is however important to note that the development proposed under the fallback position would extend out approx. 5 meters from the existing building, thereby also protruding beyond the 45-degree line regardless. In addition, the outlook from the flat is considered highly urbanised with commercial kitchens extending out to the rear and existing development at the site in view. Further, as the proposed extension is to the north, more open views to the south and access to sunlight would be largely retained. It is therefore considered unlikely that the proposal would over dominate when compared with the existing and 'fallback' positions.

3 Alicia Avenue is located to the north of the proposal fronting London Road and has a large, open garden with clear views towards the site from its main amenity space, as well as three windows and a conservatory on its southern elevation facing the proposal. The proposed larger extension includes two additional windows on the northern elevation, facing directly towards the main amenity space of 3 Alicia Avenue resulting in an increased loss of privacy when compared with the fallback position. This impact is minimised however by the installation of a highlight window in the proposed bedroom and the ability to implement a condition to require a glazed window in the en-suite.

The proposed larger extension is however likely to result in a significant change in outlook at 3 Alicia Avenue, as well as increased overshadowing in the amenity space and loss of light in rooms situated on the rear and southern elevation. This would be exacerbated by the position of the extension to the south of this neighbouring property. The extension will stretch across the entirety of the boundary between the two properties and will likely dominate the space, leading to an oppressive and overbearing impact. Though the existence of the fallback position is acknowledged, it is likely that this was determined as having an acceptable impact on amenity because the ground floor extension would replace an existing outhouse and the second storey an existing roof terrace, therefore limiting the potential for impact. In this case, it is considered that the larger second storey extension would over dominate the space, thereby constituting overdevelopment of the plot and causing an unacceptable impact upon neighbouring amenity.

Noise and General Disturbance

It is considered unlikely that an additional dwelling in a residential area would cause a significant increase in the level of noise and/or general disturbance, aside from a small temporary impact during

construction. Indeed there would arguably be some betterment as the proposal would remove the existing roof terrace (as would the fallback scheme).

Overall, the scale and bulk of the proposal would result in a harmful loss of amenity to the neighbouring property, contrary to policy 33 of the HDPF.

Highways Impacts:

Policies 39 and 41 of the HDPF (2015) seek to ensure that both sufficient capacity in the existing infrastructure exists prior to the release of land for development and that adequate parking facilities are provided to meet the needs of anticipated users. In addition, Policy ASH3 of the Ashington Neighbourhood Plan (ANP, 2021) requires development to provide suitable off-street parking and ensure it is in conformity with West Sussex Residential Parking Demand calculations.

Access to the proposed dwellings would be from the existing access point on London Road, which also serves the existing salon located to the front of the building. The submitted application form states that there are currently 3 parking spaces available on site which would be retained as part of the proposal. West Sussex Highways were consulted as part of the application and advised that the additional dwelling would not give rise to significant material intensification of movements to or from the site. They did however highlight that a development of this size, in this location would require at least 5 car parking spaces.

The site has 3 parking spaces available and the proposal would therefore not be in conformity with Policy ASH3(a) of the ANP. However, Policy ASH3(c) states that if off-street provision is unfeasible then on-street parking provision will be permitted provided it does not have an unacceptable impact on highways safety. West Sussex Highways have confirmed in their consultation response that they do not believe that the shortfall of car parking provision would result in a highways safety impact, therefore parking provision is acceptable from a policy perspective. Officers have no reason to disagree with this conclusion.

Water Neutrality:

A 2021 Position Statement from Natural England identified that it could not be concluded with the required degree of certainty that new development in the Sussex North Water Supply Zone would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the Arun Valley SAC, SPA and Ramsar sites. As a consequence, and to comply with the legal duties set out in the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (known as the Habitat Regulations), all new development since has been required to demonstrate water neutrality.

On 31st October 2025 Natural England formally withdrew the 2021 Position Statement, citing a package of measures that they were satisfied would safeguard the Arun Valley sites. Principal amongst these measures is a reduction in the Southern Water abstraction licence 'by March 2026'. However, given the licence change has not yet taken place Horsham District Council, as competent authority under the Habitats Regulations, cannot yet be certain that new development will not result in adverse impacts on the Arun Valley sites.

To ensure development can come forward as water neutral in the meantime, the Council has agreed with Natural England to use the significant water savings made by Southern Water in 2024/25 through their programme of leakage reduction (amongst other measures). This has generated some 3,240,000 litres per day of water savings that can now be attributed to new development without increasing water abstraction in the Arun Valley beyond baseline. These savings were previously to be used to launch the Sussex North Water Certification Scheme (SNWCS), however following the withdrawal statement SNWCS will no longer be launching. Natural England standing advice dated 10 November 2025 raises no objection to using these savings to enable development to come forward. The standing advice clarifies that it functions as Natural England's formal response pursuant to Regulation 63(3) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 to all relevant planning applications which seek to achieve water neutrality using the above Southern Water savings.

Officers have undertaken an Appropriate Assessment which demonstrates that the anticipated increase in mains water consumption from this development, alongside all other development granted since the 31st October 2025, will not exceed 3,240,000 litres per day.

Accordingly, Officers consider that the proposed development will not have an Adverse Effect on the Integrity of the Arun Valley Site, either alone or in combination with other plan and projects, thereby complying with Regulations 63 and 70 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, HDPF Policy 31, and paragraph 193 of the NPPF.

Drainage and Flood Risk:

Policy 38 of the HDPF states that development should follow a sequential approach to flood risk management, giving priority to development with the lowest risk of flooding and making required development safe without increasing flooding elsewhere. In addition, paragraph 170 of the NPPF discourages inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding by directing development away from the areas at highest risk, while Paragraph 173 states that a sequential risk-based approach should be taken to individual applications in areas known to be at risk now or in future from any form of flooding.

The application site lies within Flood Zone 1, which is land defined by the Planning Practice Guidance for the NPPF for Flood Risk and Coastal Change as having a low probability of flooding. The site is also not at risk from surface water flooding nor is it located within a groundwater vulnerability area.

Horsham District Council's Drainage Officer was consulted on the application and raised concerns around the drainage hierarchy, namely that the method of surface water drainage (soakaways) would not be feasible at the site due to the underlying geology, as well as requiring a foul and surface water drainage strategy to be submitted.

At the time of receiving this advice, the application was already recommended for refusal for other reasons and it was therefore deemed inappropriate to ask the applicant to undertake further work. Nevertheless, in this instance it is considered that this matter could be suitably resolved by way of planning condition.

Other Matters:

Climate Change:

Policies 35, 36 and 37 require that development mitigates to the impacts of climate change through measures including improved energy efficiency, reducing flood risk, reducing water consumption, improving biodiversity and promoting sustainable transport modes. These policies reflect the requirements of Chapter 14 of the NPPF that local plans and decisions seek to reduce the impact of development on climate change.

Therefore, conditions could be attached to secure the following:

- Water consumption limited to 110litres per person per day
- Requirement to provide full fibre broadband site connectivity

Subject to these conditions the application will suitably reduce the impact of the development on climate change in accordance with local and national policy.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG):

Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021) mandates that every development must achieve at least a 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) (unless the development qualifies as exempt under the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024) and that every planning permission granted for the development of land in England shall be deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that development must not be begun unless a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority and the planning authority has approved the Plan.

The Biodiversity Gain Plan must show how the development will achieve the required minimum 10% BNG using the statutory biodiversity metric tool, and must demonstrate how the habitats will be managed and maintained for 30 years, starting from the date the development is completed. Off-site gains (on unregistered sites) and significant on-site enhancements will be secured over this period by way of a Legal Agreement.

The Applicant has demonstrated that the development is exempt from the requirement to achieve a minimum 10% BNG by reason of:

- The development qualifies as 'de minimis' under Regulation 4 of the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024

Conclusions:

The application site lies within the built-up area boundary of Ashington where the principle of new residential development is supported under Policy 3 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) (2015), subject to compliance with all other relevant policies. The proposal would deliver one additional dwelling in a sustainable and accessible location, making a modest but positive contribution towards the District's housing supply.

However, the proposal would significantly increase the scale and massing of the building to a level that would be considered overdevelopment of the site when compared with the net developable area. It is considered that this would not be in keeping with the surrounding development and therefore would not be in line with the requirements of Policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF (2015). In addition, the proposal is likely to cause an unacceptable impact on the amenity of occupants at 3 Amelia Avenue as a result of its overbearing nature and will likely lead to a degree of overshadowing and loss of light and outlook.

It is recognised that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply, where the proposal would provide a modest contribution to the identified housing need. Whilst this is a material consideration of significant weight, as outlined above, the proposed development would result in adverse harm to nearby residential properties, which would not be significantly or demonstrably outweighed by the benefits of the proposal. It is therefore concluded that the proposed development be refused.

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)

Horsham District Council has adopted a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule which took effect on 1st October 2017.

It is considered that this development constitutes CIL liable development.

Use Description	Proposed	Existing	Net Gain
	150	93	57
		Total Gain	57
		Total Demolition	0

Please note that the above figures will be reviewed by the CIL Team prior to issuing a CIL Liability Notice and may therefore change.

Exemptions and/or reliefs may be applied for up until the commencement of a chargeable development.

In the event that planning permission is granted, a CIL Liability Notice will be issued thereafter. CIL payments are payable on commencement of development.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason(s) for Refusal:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its two storey scale and bulk extending across the full depth of the site, represents an overdevelopment of the site that would be harmful to the appearance of the site and the surrounding area, contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
2. The proposed development would result in a significant overbearing impact and loss of light and outlook to the neighbouring property at 3 Alicia Avenue by reason of its two storey scale and bulk extending across the full depth of the site, contrary to Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

NOTE TO APPLICANT

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/26/0131

(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

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

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Floor plan	Proposed	NONE	19.02.2026
Design & Access Statement		NONE	19.02.2026
Elevation & Floor plan	Existing Floor, Existing and Proposed Elevations	NONE	27.01.2026
Location & Block plan		NONE	27.01.2026

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Sophie Moore Date: 07/04/2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial Adrian Smith Date: 07/04/2026