DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:
DC/24/1349
29 Kings Stone Avenue, Steyning, West Sussex, BN44 3FJ

DESCRIPTION:
Demolition of existing side garage and erection of a two storey side and rear extension. Installation of three rooflights to front elevation.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

UB/61/61	Provision of additional two rooms in roof space	Application Permitted on 06.12.1961

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

Steyning Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019-2031:
SNDP2- Responsible Environmental Design
SNDP3- Contribution to Character

Horsham District Local Plan (2023-40) (Regulation 19):
Policy 9: Water Neutrality
Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 19: Development Quality
Policy 20: Development Principles

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, on the basis of overdevelopment of small semi-detached chalet bungalow which would impinge on the attached bungalow.

Representations:
Two representations were received, objecting to the proposal for the following reasons: -

- Overdevelopment
- Privacy, light and noise
- Overshadowing from the six-metre two-storey side and rear extension
- Existing dwelling is small and the scale of proposed development would be out of character

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 SNDP2 and SNDP3 of the SNDP requires development to be appropriate to their scale and nature to promote responsible environmental design, as well as to respond positively and sensitively to the scale, mass, height, building materials and form of neighbouring properties.

The application site comprises a semi-detached bungalow which lies within the settlement boundary of Steyning. The surrounding area features a variety of building forms, with two-storey terraced housing to the north and semi-detached and detached bungalows to the south, with various later extensions and alterations visible from the street.

This application proposes demolition of the existing side garage and for the erection of a side extension, which would include a hip to gable roof extension, and a two-storey side projection which would link into a two-storey rear gabled projection. The scheme also includes a single-storey rear extension and a flat-roofed rear dormer.

There is no objection in principle to extending the existing property in order to create additional living accommodation on the site. There are though significant concerns in respect of the design approach proposed by this application. The side gabled roof form would appreciably unbalance the existing pair of properties, and the scheme would introduce a sizeable two-storey element to the side and rear,

which together with the rear dormer, would dominate the host building, creating the appearance of a two-storey dwelling (attached to a bungalow). This impact would be particularly visible from the front but also from the rear, where the size of the dormer extend for virtually the full width and height of the roofslope, with the intended finish to the dormer creating the appearance of a second storey rather than an extended roof.

It is acknowledged that the application site neighbours a two-storey terraced row of properties, and there is appreciable variation in the built form along the road. In this context the loss of symmetry within the semi-detached may not, in isolation, be considered particularly harmful. It is though considered that the proposal, by reason of its scale, mass and design would not be sympathetic to the form or proportions of the host building, appearing instead as unduly dominant and intrusive additions which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area, contrary to 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.

Policy SNDP3 seeks to ensure development contributes positively towards the character of Steyning through respecting neighbouring amenity.

The proposal was amended as part of the application process to reduce the depth of the rear extension to approximately 4 metres. The adjoining property (within the pair) to the south has been previously extended to the rear, and the presence of this extension would largely mitigate any potential unacceptable impacts arising from the proposed rear extension. There would remain separation between the extended northern elevation and the neighbouring property, which sits on a different orientation, such that while visible the rear outlook and light (to the neighbour) would not experience unacceptable harm.

There is a degree of mutual overlooking between properties, and while the proposal would introduce new openings at first floor level the resulting arrangement would not be unusual or unexpected in an established residential location such as this, no unacceptable loss of privacy would result.

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 (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.

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 not considered to comply with relevant local and national planning policies and is therefore recommended for refusal.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason(s) for Refusal:

1. The development, by reason of its scale, mass and design would not be sympathetic to the form or proportions of the host building, appearing instead as unduly dominant and intrusive additions which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy SNDP3 of the Steyning Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019-2031.

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/24/1349
Schedule of plans/documents **not approved**:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Location plan		NONE	05.09.2024
Floor plan	PROPOSED GF PLAN	A 445-2_1	25.10.2024
Floor plan	PROPOSED 1F PLAN	A 445-4_1	25.10.2024
Roof plan	PROPOSED ROOF PLAN	A 445-6_1	25.10.2024
Elevation plan	PROPOSED ELEVATIONS	A 445-8_1	25.10.2024
Details Plan	3D VISUAL REAR	A 445-9_1	25.10.2024
Block plan	BLOCK PLAN	A 445-10_1	25.10.2024

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Joshua Lee Date: 15.11.2024

Authorising Officer sign/initial Guy Everest Date: 20.11.2024