DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/24/0192
Gatewick Lodge , Broadford Bridge Road, West Chiltington, West Sussex, RH20 2LF

DESCRIPTION:

Erection of ground floor extensions, first floor extensions and installation of new roof.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

WC/24/68	New bedroom, front and rear entrance, hall, replacement garage, study and new windows (From old Planning History)	Application Permitted on 10.06.1968

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):
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

West Chiltington Neighbourhood Plan

Parish Design Statement

REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS RESPONSES

Consultations:

HDC Conservation: Comment

The proposed substantial extension of the cottage will prevent it being understood and appreciated as a historic building. However, it is of limited interest in its own right as there is no surviving country house to reinforce its purpose. No objection on heritage grounds.

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.

WSCC Highways: Comment

The site is located on Broadford Bridge Road, a C-classified road subject to a speed restriction of 40 mph in this location. The proposals would not be anticipated to give rise to a material intensification of use of the existing access point on Broadford Bridge Road.

An existing single-bay garage will be lost as part of the proposals. Therefore, any displaced parking would have to be accommodated on-street. I do note that the site as existing appears to utilise the private access road for the parking of cars. The LHA would not anticipate that the loss of the garage would lead to a highway safety concern or parking capacity issue, but the LPA may wish to consider the potential amenity impact on on-street parking in this location.

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 115), and that there are no transport grounds to resist the proposal.

Parish Comments: Object

The scale of the proposed extensions (outwards and upwards) is too substantial in relation to the existing dwelling and its siting, with the increased height adversely affect the general amenity of the residents of its neighbouring bungalows, for example by shading installed solar panels. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies 28(2) and 33(2) of the HDPF.

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

Policy 28 of the HDPF relates to house extensions in the countryside, stating that extensions should not be disproportionate to the size of the existing dwelling and should be in keeping with the scale and character of the existing dwelling.

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 34 of the HDPF relates to heritage assets, stating that the Council will sustain and enhance its historic environment through positive management of development affecting heritage assets, and that development should, inter alia, reinforce the special character of the historic environment through appropriate siting, scale, form and design (including the use of traditional materials and techniques), and preserve, and ensure clear legibility of, locally distinctive vernacular building forms and their settings, features, fabric and materials.

Gatewick Lodge is a late nineteenth century single storey dwelling probably associated with Gatewick Farm when this was a much larger farmstead. There is evidence that the farm complex was larger in the mid to late nineteenth century. The early edition O.S. County series maps show that in the early twentieth century the complex of buildings covered a significantly smaller area. The lodge may have been a prelude to a large country house that was never built and is reflective of polite architecture, contrasting with what might be expected of a farm that dates back to at least the late sixteenth century based on the age of the surviving farmhouse. The lodge is considered to represent a non-designated heritage asset due to its subtle *cottage orné* design and its illustration of the socio-economic changes in rural areas following the crash of agricultural land prices in the early nineteenth century.

The proposal entails the substantial remodelling and extension of the existing building, and this would dilute its appreciation as a historic building. It is though recognised that the lodge is of limited interest in its own right, as its purpose is not reinforced by any surviving country house. The proposed extensions / alterations would reflect elements of the existing building and is considered to be of an appropriate design and form. It is not therefore considered that the proposal would result in any adverse impact on the actual significance or interest of the non-designated heritage asset.

The site is within a small cluster of development of varying scale, with the increased bulk and massing proposed such that it would not appear intrusive or unduly dominant in this location. The submission does not indicate any changes to the site boundary treatment, which currently provides some screening in views from Broadford Bridge Road.

It is acknowledged that the proposal would represent a sizeable addition to the existing building, and this would be readily seen in views from surrounding properties and land. The scale of the resulting building is not considered to represent a harmful overdevelopment of the site and would sit appropriately in the context of surrounding development. It is considered that taking into account all relevant matters the resulting building would not be harmfully disproportionate in relation to that existing on the site, and that in the absence of any demonstrable harm any conflict with Policy 28 would not amount to a reason to refuse the application.

The site is not appreciated in the context of Clayes Farm, a Grade II Listed Building, and there would be no adverse impact on the setting of this building.

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 proposed extensions / alterations would be contained within existing site boundaries with appreciable separation retained between the resulting building and neighbours. It is considered that this layout / siting would be sufficient to prevent any unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity. The siting of new first floor window openings and the relationship with neighbouring properties / boundaries is considered sufficient to prevent any intrusive views, and no unacceptable loss of privacy would arise from the proposal.

The proposal would generate impacts arising from construction activities. These impacts would though be short-term and the domestic scale of the proposal is such that no unacceptable harm would be expected. As such no conditions in this regard are considered necessary.

For the reasons set out, it is considered that the siting and layout of the proposal and the resulting relationship with adjoining properties would be sufficient to prevent any unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity.

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.

Highways

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 where the need for the development overrides the loss of parking (and where necessary measures are in place to mitigate against the impact).

The application includes the loss of an existing single-bay garage with vehicular access derived from a private road along the southern boundary of the site. The layout would retain separation between the private road and dwellinghouse, with this space providing on-site parking in a manner comparable to the existing parking arrangement. This arrangement is considered sufficient to ensure no harmful displaced parking occurs, with the proposal not expected to create an intensification of use of the existing access point onto Broadford Bridge Road.

Ecology

The application site is within the Red Impact Zone for Great Crested Newt, indicating that suitable habitat is present in the surrounding landscape. The nature of the proposal is though such that any risk is low and no adverse impacts are envisaged. An informative is though recommended to remind the applicant of their responsibilities under separate / non-planning legislation.

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 application form and approved plans.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

NOTE TO APPLICANT

The applicant is reminded that, under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), it is an offence to (amongst other things): deliberately capture, disturb, injure or kill great crested newts; damage or destroy a breeding or resting place; intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to a resting or sheltering place. Planning permission for a development does not provide a defence against prosecution under this legislation. Should great crested newts be found at any stage of the development works, then all works should cease, and a professional and/or suitably qualified and experienced ecologist (of Natural England) should be contacted for advice on any special precautions before continuing, including the need for a licence.

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/24/0192

(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 plan	Proposed Elevations	E-1934-H-02/3	05.02.2024
Floor plan	Existing Ground Floor and Roof Plan	S-1934-H-01/1	05.02.2024
Elevation plan	Existing Elevations	S-1934-H-01/2	05.02.2024
Floor plan	Proposed Ground Floor Plan	E-1934-H-02/1	05.02.2024
Floor plan	Proposed First Floor Plan	E-1934-H-02/2	05.02.2024
Supporting Docs	Application Form	NONE	05.02.2024
Location plan	Location Plan	1 934/H/10.0	09.02.2024
Block plan	Proposed Block Plan	1 934/H/10.2	09.02.2024

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Guy Everest Date: 08.04.2024

Authorising Officer sign/initial Tamara Dale Date: 10.04.2024