



**DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET**

**APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:**

DC/26/0296

25 Depot Road, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 5HE

**DESCRIPTION:**

Erection of a first floor rear extension over existing ground floor, conversion of loft into habitable living space with the installation of a rear dormer and 2no. rooflights to the front elevation, and installation of new roof to existing porch.

**RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:**

DC/20/1858

Change of use of the grass verge to the front of the property to residential land. Erection of a single storey side extension and a storage shed to the rear of existing garage. Alterations to existing driveway by creation of a dropped kerb and construction of a bike store. Part retrospective replacement of existing boundary fence.

Application Permitted on  
26.01.2021

**RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES**

**The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

**Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):**

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

Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development

Policy 33 - Development Principles

**Horsham Blueprint Business Neighbourhood Plan (HBBNP) 2019 – 2036:**

Policy HB3: Character of Development

Policy HB4: Design of Development

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

**Consultations:**

None received.

**Neighbourhood Council Comments:**

No objection.

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**

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 HB3, Character of Development, of the Horsham Blueprint Business Neighbourhood Plan states that, "Development is expected to preserve and enhance the Character Area in which it is located. The design of new development should take account of the local context and reflect the character and vernacular of the area, using architectural variety in form and materials, in order to avoid building design that is inappropriate to the Plan area. Innovation in design will be supported, however, where this demonstrably enhances the quality of the built form in a character area".

Policy HB4, Design of Development, of the Horsham Blueprint Business Neighbourhood Plan states that – "Development is expected to demonstrate a high quality of design, which responds and integrates well with its surroundings"

The proposal would involve the erection of a first-floor rear extension over an existing ground floor projection, together with a loft conversion entailing a hip to gable side extension, rear dormer and front rooflights. The submitted plans also indicate a new gabled roof over an existing flat roofed porch.

The host building comprises one half of a semi-detached pair which features a hipped roof which creates a pleasing sense of symmetry. There is though variation between properties in the immediate street scene, including examples of gabled roofs and rear dormers. It is noted that a full width and full height rear dormer was refused planning permission at no. 31 Depot Road under ref: DC/18/2394. A subsequent appeal against this decision was dismissed, with the Inspector stating (at paragraph 5): -

*'.....the dormer would be overtly dominant, unsympathetic and thereby harmful to the character and appearance of the host building. In my view it would be perceived as the addition of a full third storey to the building rather than part of a loft conversion and would unbalance the existing proportions of the rear elevation'.*

The above conclusion is relevant to the roof extension proposed by this current application. The rear dormer in particular would dominate the rear roof of the building and would create a top-heavy addition which fails to respect the proportions and form of the host building. This visual impact would be extenuated by the presence of a first-floor rear extension, the roof of which would intersect with the dormer. The combination of both extensions would create a sense of bulk and mass which is not

currently present at either the site or surrounding properties. This would be clearly visible from the side and rear of the site, with public views possible along Stirling Way.

It is acknowledged that the dwelling would benefit from permitted development rights for roof extensions. It is not though apparent that these rights would allow a dormer which intersects with the roof of the first-floor extension in the manner proposed. It is not therefore apparent that a fallback position which exists which would allow the roof extension to be erected through permitted development rights; and in any case, such rights would not allow a first-floor rear extension on this site.

The proposed rear extensions would introduce significant additional mass and are considered to be of a design, form and scale which would be inappropriate to the character and appearance of the host building, and which would harm the character or appearance of the wider area. It is therefore considered that the visual impact of the proposal is not 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 first-floor rear extension would be sited along the shared (side) boundary of the site. While this boundary line is splayed it is considered the height and depth would adversely impact outlook and would appear overbearing. This would be appreciated from ground and first floor window openings as well as the amenity space to the immediate rear of the (neighbouring) dwelling. This impact is considered to be unacceptable and would adversely impact on living conditions for occupants of the adjoining property, contrary to the above policy.

### **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**

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 be contrary with the above-mentioned policies and guidance therefore the development is recommended for refusal.

### **Recommendation: Application Refused**

#### **Reason(s) for Refusal:**

1. The rear extensions by reason of their scale, form and design would represent discordant, unduly dominant and incongruous additions which would be inappropriate to the character and appearance of the host building, and which would harm the character or appearance of the wider area. The visual impact of the proposal is not acceptable and would be contrary to

Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policies HB3 and HB4 of the Horsham Blueprint Business Neighbourhood Plan.

2. The first-floor rear extension by, reason of its height and siting in relation to the shared eastern boundary, would appear overbearing and result in a loss of outlook and an increased sense of enclosure for the neighbouring property, to the detriment of their amenity. The extent of this impact would be contrary to 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/26/0296**

(The approved plans will form Condition 1 on the Decision Notice of all Permitted applications)

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

| <b>Plan Type</b>      | <b>Description</b>      | <b>Drawing Number</b> | <b>Received Date</b> |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Elevation plan        | EXISTING                | NONE                  | 06.03.2026           |
| Floor plan            | EXISTING AND ROOF PLANS | NONE                  | 06.03.2026           |
| Location plan         |                         | NONE                  | 06.03.2026           |
| Photos                | PHOTO REPORT            | NONE                  | 06.03.2026           |
| Elevation plan        | PROPOSED                | NONE                  | 06.03.2026           |
| Location & Block plan |                         | NONE                  | 06.03.2026           |
| Floor plan            | PROPOSED AND ROOF PLANS | NONE                  | 06.03.2026           |

#### **DELEGATED**

Case Officer sign/initial     Halima Chowdhury     Date: 09.04.2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial     Guy Everest     Date: 16.04.2026