Horsham District Council

# DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:
DC/24/1753
29 Morrell Avenue, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 4DD

DESCRIPTION:
Erection of a single storey rear and side extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
None

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES
**The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

**Horsham District Planning Framework (2015)**:
Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33 - Development Principles

**North Horsham neighbourhood planning:**
North Horsham Parish Council voluntarily withdrew their parish from the Neighbourhood Development Plan process on 30 July 2018.

**Horsham District Local Plan (2023-40) (Regulation 19)**:
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:
No comments received.

Representations:
1 objection received raising concerns about loss of light, shadowing, visual impact and privacy and suggestion of a flat roof design.

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. A site visit was carried out following the received objection from a neighbour. 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.

29 Morrell Avenue is a semi-detached dwelling in the build up boundary of Horsham. Permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear and side extension. The dwelling is a bungalow style, and the proposed extension is for additional living space to provide a utility room and larger kitchen. The garage is unaffected on the side of the property and the utility room is an addition to the rear of the garage. Therefore, the extensions are not visible from the public realm.

The proposed materials are to match those of the existing, with the exception of windows. There is white/cream render and low-level brick on the walls. The roof tiles are to match existing profiled concrete interlocking tile with a flat roof to match that of the garage. The windows are currently a mixture of light green and white UPVC, the proposed is for all white UPVC. The doors are light green and white UPVC.

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(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.

The neighbouring objection from the property to the east (No. 31) is noted. Concerns have been raised regarding loss of light from the pitch roof design, overshadowing and visual impact. The proposed extension comprises a pitched roof to the main part of the dwelling, set some 2.5m from the shared boundary, comprising a ridge set some 0.9m below that of the main roof of the dwelling, with a flat roof to the eastern side towards the neighbouring boundary with an eaves height 0.5m higher than the existing flat roof element.

It is noted that both the application site and neighbouring dwelling host attached integral garages along the shared boundary- the modest 0.5m increase in eaves height would not result in an undue level of loss of light over and above the existing arrangement, especially when considering the use of the adjoining garage. It is noted that the neighbour hosts a conservatory to the rear- the proposed extension would extend behind the rear 'building line' of the neighbouring conservatory. The gap between the properties to the rear on the neighbour's side would be maintained. As the proposed extension would extend no further than the neighbouring conservatory, this arrangement is not considered undue in a built-up residential location. In addition, the pitched roof element of the extension would be set further away from the neighbouring conservatory (some 5m), and in any case would be lower than that of the main roof of the dwelling. Given this arrangement, no adverse impact warranting of refusal is foreseen.

Whilst the proposed would result in a perceived increase in built form along the shared boundary, owing to the increased ridge height of the flat roof addition along the boundary, this would result in no more than a loss of slight views from the neighbouring property, and a glimpse of the proposed pitched roof. The increased height is not so excessive as to result in a loss of light or overshadowing over and above the existing fencing arrangement. Furthermore, given the existing north-westerly orientation of the pair of dwellings, the rear elevation of both dwelling would already experience a diminished intake of light- the increase in building form along this boundary would not unduly increase this impact.

In addition to the above, no windows are proposed to the side elevation of the extension that would result in an increased opportunity of overlooking. Whilst fenestration would be bought closer to the rear boundary, this would in any case be obscured by existing fencing. The resultant impact would not be dissimilar from the existing arrangement.

With the above in mind, 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. The proposal therefore accords 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 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 to be used in the development hereby permitted shall strictly accord with those indicated on the proposed plans and application form.

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/24/1753**

Schedule of plans/documents **approved**:

| Plan Type | Description | Drawing Number | Received Date |
|---|---|---|---|
| Elevation & Floor plan | Existing and Proposed, Section, Block and Location Plan | J1728-15 | 13.11.2024 |

**DELEGATED**

Case Officer sign/initial Meg Bayliss Date: 06/01/2025

Authorising Officer sign/initial RHERMITAGE Date: 27.01.2025