

Planning Statement

Erection of a two-storey rear extension and first and second floor (roof) levels, alterations to first floor front window opening and formation of new first floor side window opening

48 Barrington Road, Horsham

Prepared by

WPS Planning

Planning Statement
48 Barrington Road



Prepared by:	Doug Wright
Date:	Jan 2025
Project Number:	186/2025

Contents

1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA	1
3.0 PLANNING HISTORY OF THE SITE	2
4.0 THE PROPOSAL	2
5.0 PLANNING POLICY	3
6.0 PLANNING ASSESSMENT	4
7.0 CONCLUSION	10

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This Planning Statement accompanies a revised submission for 48 Barrington Road. It has been prepared to respond directly to the Council's Delegated Report and the reasons for refusal relating to application DC/25/1254.

1.2 The refusal reason(s) focus on:

- Design / visual impact: the previous scheme was considered dominant and intrusive within the rear garden environment and harmful to the appearance of the host dwelling (referencing HDPF Policies 32 and 33 and national design objectives).
- Residential amenity: the previous scheme was considered to create an overbearing relationship—particularly to the southern neighbour—due to scale/height and proximity (HDPF Policy 33).

1.3 The revised proposal is intended to retain the objective of improved accommodation while addressing the above concerns through a more proportionate form, improved elevation treatment, and (where necessary) targeted safeguards by condition.

2.0 SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA

2.1 The application site comprises a two storey property situated within an established built-up area of Horsham, West Sussex. The site forms part of a predominantly residential street characterised by detached and semi-detached dwellings set within generous plots, with private rear gardens and a varied pattern of household extensions and roof alterations that reflect the area's incremental evolution over time.

2.2 The application site comprises the host dwelling and its associated residential curtilage, with frontage to Barrington Road and a defined rear garden environment to the back of the property. The surrounding area is suburban in character, with residential amenity and the retention of local character being key

considerations. The site is not isolated and sits within a context where domestic development and alteration is common, including rear extensions and roof-level additions on nearby properties.

3.0 PLANNING HISTORY

3.1 The site has the following planning history for the site:

- DC/24/0376 – Demolition of single storey rear extension; erection of a single storey rear extension; change of use from commercial unit into 2 no. ground floor apartments; conversion of loft to increase size of existing apartment - Permitted
- DC/25/1254 – Erection of a two-storey rear extension and first and second floor (roof) levels; alterations to first-floor front window opening; formation of new first-floor side window opening - Refused

4.0 THE PROPOSAL

4.1 The revised submission seeks to deliver additional accommodation through rear/upper-level alterations, but in a manner that is more settled, more coherent and less visually assertive than the refused scheme described by officers.

4.2 The revised elevations show a more ordered composition and clearer hierarchy between the original dwelling and the additions, reducing the perception of a single “full height” rear mass.

4.3 In summary, the revised proposal:

- strengthens the visual subservience of the additions to the host dwelling;
- reduces the perception of rear bulk through improved articulation and a more balanced solid-to-void arrangement;
- maintains a domestic rhythm of fenestration, with scope for privacy controls by condition where necessary.

5.0 PLANNING POLICY

National Planning Policy

- 5.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development and that this should run through both plan-making and decision-taking. In terms of the determination of planning applications this should mean the approval of developments that accord with the development plan without delay, and that where the development plan is silent or relevant policies are out of date, that permission be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, or policies of the NPPF indicate otherwise.
- 5.2 Sustainable development is seen within the NPPF as having three roles, namely an economic, social and environmental role which should be a golden thread running through both plan making and decision taking.
- 5.3 The following sections within the NPPF are important factors in the assessment of the proposal:
- Section 2 – Achieving sustainable development
 - Section 11 – Making effective use of land
 - Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places

Local Plan

- 5.4 In terms of the local planning policy context for the Application Site, the adopted Development Plan for the Horsham District is composed of the following relevant documents:
- Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) – Adopted November 2015.
 - Policy 1 - Sustainable Development
 - Policy 32 – The Quality of New Development

- Policy 33 – Development Principles
- Horsham District Local Plan (2023-40) (Regulation 19)
 - Policy 1 - Sustainable Development
 - Policy 19 - Development Quality
 - Policy 20 – Development Principle

6.0 PLANNING ASSESSMENT

Design, scale and visual impact

- 6.1 The Delegated Report concluded that the previous proposal would be dominant and intrusive, with particular criticism directed at the overall massing and the perception of an excessive "full height" intervention at the rear, leading to harm to the host dwelling's appearance and the rear garden environment. The Council therefore considered conflict with HDPF Policies 32 and 33 and relevant national design objectives.
- 6.2 The revised submission has been prepared with the specific intention of responding to the above concerns. When assessed against the policy tests in Policy 32 (quality of design) and Policy 33 (appropriate development principles and neighbour relationships), the revised scheme represents a materially improved design outcome.
- 6.3 A key design test for domestic extensions is whether the additions remain clearly secondary to the host building. The revised elevations demonstrate a clearer hierarchy between the host dwelling and the proposed additions. In particular, the rear composition reads more as a coherent domestic extension rather than an overly assertive continuation of the main building envelope. This approach directly addresses the prior criticism that the proposal would appear as an over-dominant "full height" intervention.
- 6.4 Perceived dominance is not solely a matter of raw dimensions; it is also influenced by the degree of articulation, the relationship between solid walling

and openings, and whether the extension reads as a single monolithic block. The revised elevations present a more balanced and articulated rear facade, which reduces the visual impression of bulk when experienced from the rear garden environment and from neighbouring vantage points.

- 6.5 This is important because the Delegated Report's concern was not that rear alteration was unacceptable in principle, but that the previous form was visually excessive. The revised scheme's more resolved elevation treatment reduces the likelihood that it would be perceived as intrusive or out of keeping.
- 6.6 The Delegated Report acknowledges that the surrounding area displays a pattern of change, including rear alterations and roof-level interventions (including dormer forms).
- 6.7 The revised scheme aligns more comfortably with that established pattern by presenting a more conventional and context-responsive domestic form. It therefore better satisfies Policy 32's objective that new development should respond positively to local character and distinctiveness, rather than appearing as an incongruous or overly dominant addition.
- 6.8 Policy 32 expects development to enhance, or at least preserve, local character and to demonstrate good architectural quality. The revised elevations show a more coherent composition in which the additions are better integrated with the host dwelling's form and rhythm.
- 6.9 In design terms, the revised scheme provides an improved "read" of the building, with the original property remaining legible and the extension elements expressing themselves as subordinate and complementary rather than visually competing components.
- 6.10 For the reasons above, the revised scheme is considered to meet the requirements of HDPF Policy 32 and, insofar as Policy 33 addresses character and relationships, it avoids the excessive visual harm identified in the refusal. In NPPF terms, it delivers a more appropriate standard of design that is sympathetic to context and avoids undue visual intrusion.

Residential amenity

- 6.11 The Delegated Report concluded that the previous proposal would harm residential amenity-particularly to the southern neighbour-by way of an overbearing relationship arising from the scale/height and proximity of the development, leading to an unacceptable impact on outlook and the neighbouring garden environment.
- 6.12 Policy 33 requires development to protect the amenity of adjoining occupiers and avoid unacceptable harm through dominance, enclosure, loss of light, overlooking or disturbance. The revised scheme has been designed to reduce the impacts identified in the report and to secure a more balanced neighbour relationship.
- 6.13 The planning test is not whether there will be any impact (as most domestic extensions have some effect), but whether the impact would be unacceptable and would materially harm reasonable residential enjoyment. The revised elevations show a more controlled and proportionate rear/side composition, reducing the perception of a continuous, dominant "full height" presence close to the boundary.
- 6.14 This directly responds to the report's emphasis on dominance and the experience of the extension from neighbouring garden areas.
- 6.15 Outlook impacts are assessed in terms of whether the relationship becomes unduly oppressive. The revised scheme's improved articulation and calmer rear elevation treatment reduces the perceived massing when viewed from the southern neighbour's garden and rear-facing areas.
- 6.16 In this context, it is also relevant that the area is residential in character and that rear additions are not unusual; therefore, a degree of change in outlook is to be expected and is not, in itself, determinative. The revised proposal seeks to keep that change within acceptable bounds, consistent with Policy 33.

- 6.17 While the Delegated Report raised concern about scale/height and proximity, the revised scheme moderates the visual presence that can contribute to perceived loss of light and enclosure. The revised composition reduces the impression of a tall, flat plane at the rear. This is a meaningful improvement because it is often the "wall effect" (continuous vertical mass close to a boundary) that exacerbates amenity harm.
- 6.18 The report records local representations which include concerns about impacts to neighbouring living conditions.
- 6.19 In domestic design terms, privacy is typically addressed through careful window positioning and proportionate controls. Where any upper-level side-facing windows could give rise to a perception of overlooking, this can be robustly managed through conditions requiring obscure glazing and restricted opening where necessary. This is a standard approach and ensures continued compliance with Policy 33.
- 6.20 Overall, the revised scheme is materially improved in its relationship to adjoining occupiers-particularly to the southern neighbour-by reducing dominance and the overbearing character identified in the refusal. With proportionate safeguards (if considered necessary by officers), the proposal is capable of full compliance with HDPF Policy 33.

Planning history and fallback position as a material consideration

- 6.21 The Delegated Report confirms a previous permission under DC/24/0376 for a single-storey rear extension and associated changes. This fallback position is material for the following reasons:
- It demonstrates that the Council has accepted the principle of rear extension at the site.
 - It indicates that some degree of built change at the rear could occur in any event.

- It provides helpful context when judging whether the revised scheme would create an unacceptable planning harm, or whether it represents a policy-compliant evolution of the site which can be controlled appropriately.

6.22 In this case, the revised scheme should be viewed as a proposal that seeks to achieve a better overall design solution than the refused scheme described by officers, while retaining the opportunity for improved accommodation, and doing so without introducing the unacceptable impacts previously alleged.

Other matters raised in representations

6.23 The Delegated Report records concerns raised by neighbours and the Parish Council, including issues such as parking pressure and general disturbance.

6.24 While these matters are noted, they were not the stated reasons for refusal. The determinative issues were design/character and neighbour amenity. The revised scheme has been specifically shaped to address those determinative matters, and it is therefore considered that the reasons for refusal are no longer substantiated when applied to the amended proposal.

Planning conditions (if required)

6.25 If the Council considers it necessary to provide certainty and ensure ongoing compliance with Policy 33, the following conditions would be reasonable and proportionate:

- Approved plans condition to list the revised drawing(s), including 186/2025/5.
- External materials to match the existing dwelling (unless otherwise agreed).
- Privacy safeguarding to any side-facing upper-level window(s) where required (obscure glazing and restricted opening).

6.26 These conditions would be precise, enforceable, and directly related to the impacts under consideration.

7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 This Planning Statement supports a revised submission for 48 Barrington Road which has been prepared expressly to respond to the Council's Delegated Report and the refusal reasons for DC/25/1254.
- 7.2 The revised elevations demonstrate a more balanced and controlled design approach, addressing both the perceived visual dominance and the neighbour amenity concerns identified by officers.
- 7.3 The previous refusal focused on the perceived dominance and intrusive "full. The revised scheme achieves a clearer hierarchy and improved articulation, resulting in an addition that reads as a subordinate domestic extension rather than an overly assertive rear mass. It sits more comfortably within the established pattern of domestic change acknowledged in the Delegated Report and therefore complies with the objectives of HDPF Policy 32 and the design-related aims of Policy 33 and the NPPF (2024).
- 7.4 The second refusal reason related to overbearing impact, particularly to the southern neighbour, arising from scale/height and proximity. The revised scheme provides a materially improved relationship by reducing the perception of enclosure and dominance through a more controlled form and more balanced elevation treatment.
- 7.5 Where privacy controls are required, these can be secured via standard planning conditions (obscure glazing/restricted opening), ensuring continued compliance with HDPF Policy 33.
- 7.6 The existence of an extant permission under DC/24/0376 is a relevant material consideration, confirming the acceptability of rear alteration in principle and establishing a fallback position.
- 7.7 Against this context, the revised scheme represents a policy-compliant and proportionate evolution which addresses the specific issues that led to refusal and delivers a better-resolved outcome.

- 7.8 Taking the above into account, it is respectfully submitted that the revised proposal now accords with the development plan and material considerations. The reasons for refusal set out within the Delegated Report are addressed through the amended design and improved neighbour relationship, and any residual privacy matters can be managed through proportionate conditions. It is therefore respectfully requested that planning permission should be granted.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

APP/Z3825/W/22/3303603

Marlpot Meadows, Bonfire Hill, Southwater, West Sussex RH13 9BU

Appendix B

APP/Z3825/W/25/3361339

Land at Thornhill Stables, Billingshurst Road, Coolham RH13 8QN