



DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/26/0846

8 Church Street, Steyning, West Sussex, BN44 3YB

DESCRIPTION:

Erection of a two storey rear extension and alterations to fenestration.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

No relevant planning history

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 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

Steyning Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019-2031

SNDP1: Green Infrastructure & Biodiversity

SNDP3: Contribution to Character

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

Strategic Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity

Strategic Policy 19: Development Quality

Strategic Policy 20: Development Principles

Policy 21: Heritage Assets and Managing Change within the Historic Environment

Strategic Policy 24: Sustainable Transport

Policy 25: Parking

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:

HDC Conservation Team: Objection

The proposal will fail to preserve the character of the conservation area and harm the setting of the neighbouring listed building. A rear extension is acceptable in principle. However, the current proposal

is too monolithic and utilitarian in form. Although there is a two-storey flat roof extension next door at no.6 this is not an appropriate template to repeat. The proposed extension will be visible in relation to the rear of no.10 which has been attractively extended in the recent past. A redesign that includes a pitched roof with a valley gutter between the proposed and the existing rear projection is suggested. The proposed gable can continue to sit behind the existing gable and the existing verge expressed in a traditional manner.

Southern Water: No Objection

Southern Water has determined that the flow rate for the above site will remain consistent, so capacity is not an issue, and no Southern Water assets will be affected. Therefore, Southern Water has no objections to this proposal. Surface water should not be disposed of into a public foul sewer and must comply with the Hierarchy of H3 of the Building Regulation

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS:

Representations:

None received

Parish Comments:

Steyning Town Council: No Objection

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

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 34 of the HDPF seeks to ensure that proposals preserve, and ensure clear legibility of, locally distinctive vernacular building forms and their settings, features, fabric and materials. Moreover, proposed development is required to secure the viable and sustainable future of heritage assets through continued preservation by uses that are consistent with the significance of the heritage asset.

Policy 3 of the SNDP states development proposals which demonstrate how they will positively contribute towards Steyning's character will be supported. Furthermore, development proposals should respect the amenity of properties in their immediate locality, and respond positively and sensitively to the scale, mass, height, building materials and form of neighbouring properties.

8 Church Street is a two-storey end of terrace property, situated within the Built-up Area Boundary of Steyning. Whilst not statutory listed, the property is locally listed and sited within the Steyning Conservation Area. This application seeks consent for the erection of a two-storey rear extension and alterations to the fenestration. The property itself features a clay tiled roof, brick quoins infilled with flint, with a white rendered single storey extension to the rear of the property. The proposed two-storey extension will comprise a flat roof, with the walls finished in brick and white render to match the existing property and coping stones grey in colour. Where new windows and doors are proposed, these again will match the existing property.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the adjoining property at No. 6 Church Street includes a flat roof extension, there is no recorded planning history relating to this addition. It is therefore likely that the extension predates the introduction of modern planning controls in 1947. Nevertheless, Officers do not consider this to represent a particularly appropriate precedent for similar development, particularly given the site's location within the Conservation Area and the listed status of the neighbouring property. The existence of development that is considered unsympathetic or otherwise unacceptable should not, in itself, justify the replication of such development elsewhere.

Whilst there is no objection to the principle of a two-storey rear extension in this location, the proposed design is not considered acceptable. The introduction of a flat roof would result in a roof form that is contrary to the established character of the surrounding area, where pitched roofs are the prevailing form. As such, the extension would appear uncharacteristic, monolithic and utilitarian in its appearance, failing to provide a design appropriate to its context and locality.

The application site is a locally listed building within the Steyning Conservation Area and is surrounded by numerous statutory listed buildings. Therefore, the proposal must preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and preserve the setting of the heritage assets in the locality. In its current form, the proposed extension would appear as an incongruous, dominant and visually intrusive addition that is disproportionate to the scale and proportions of the host building. It would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would cause harm to the setting of neighbouring listed buildings through the introduction of a roof form that is unsympathetic. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Policies 32, 33 and 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy 3 of the Steyning Neighbourhood Development Plan (2019–2031).

Residential 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.

Whilst the extension would be two storeys in height, it would not intersect the 45-degree line measured from the quarter point of the nearest neighbouring windows at No. 10 Church Street. Furthermore, the rear wall of the proposed extension would follow the existing rear building line of the neighbouring property.

Furthermore, the extension does not propose any windows on the side elevation at first floor level, in which no issues of overlooking are therefore envisaged. It is noted that there is a side facing window on the southern elevation of No.10 Church Street. However, this is already positioned as such that its outlook faces the existing side wall of No.8 Church Street and as a result, there would be no change in the existing arrangement, with no additional overshadowing or loss of daylight envisaged.

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.

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

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason for Refusal:

- 1 The proposed extension, by virtue of its design and form, would appear out of context to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and wider area, which would appear as an incongruous addition to the host dwelling in this setting, and would be read as a visually discordant addition. The proposal would fail to preserve the character of the Steyning Conservation Area and harm the settings of the neighbouring listed buildings contrary to Policies 32, 33 and 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy 3 of the Steyning Neighbourhood Development Plan (2022).

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/26/0846

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

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Supporting Statement	Heritage Statement	A 556-12	09.06.2026
Location plan	Location Plan	NONE	22.05.2026
Design & Access Statement	Design Statement	A 556-1	22.05.2026
Floor plan	Existing Ground Floor Plan	A 556-2	22.05.2026
Floor plan	Proposed Ground Floor Plan	A 556-3	22.05.2026
Floor plan	Existing First Floor Plan	A 556-4	22.05.2026
Floor plan	Proposed First Floor Plan	A 556-5	22.05.2026
Roof plan	Existing Roof Plan	A 556-6	22.05.2026
Roof plan	Proposed Roof Plan	A 556-7	22.05.2026
Elevation plan	Existing Elevations	A 556-8	22.05.2026

Elevation plan	Proposed Elevations	A 556-9	22.05.2026
Plans	3D Visual	A 556-10	22.05.2026
Block plan	Block Plan	A 556-11	22.05.2026

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Sam Nye Date: 03/08/2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial RHERMITAGE Date: 04.08.2026