Horsham District Council

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:
DC/24/1222
104 Hormare Crescent, Storrington, West Sussex, RH20 4QR

DESCRIPTION:
Erection of a part single part two storey side extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY
None relevant

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
Policy 40- Sustainable Transport
Policy 41- Parking

Neighbourhood Plan:
Storrington Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Plan has been Made.
Policy 14- Design

Planning Advice Notes:
Facilitating Appropriate Development
Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

REPRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS RESPONSES

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:
None received

Representations:
One letter of representation received objecting to the proposed development for the following reasons:

- Trespass and Encroachment: The objection highlights potential legal problems, claiming that parts of the extension (such as the roof and gutters) would overhang onto the property of 106, constituting unauthorized trespass.
- Loss of Light and Views: The proposed extension significantly reduces the gap between the houses, affecting the amount of natural light and creating a sense of enclosure. This would alter the living environment, impacting both the ambiance and the well-being of the residents.
- Privacy and Noise: The proximity of the extension, combined with construction noise and workmen accessing 106's garden, could compromise privacy and disrupt daily life. It also mentions previous noise disturbances from renovations.
- Environmental and Structural Concerns: The extension could harm local wildlife by restricting access points for birds and insects. Additionally, structural concerns are raised regarding the potential impact on the existing boundary wall and foundations of the neighbouring property.
- Overdevelopment: There is concern that the extension contributes to overdevelopment, reducing housing diversity by favouring larger homes and potentially impacting property values and the social makeup of the area.

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 taken during case officer site visit. These details were considered sufficient to allow the application to be properly considered and determined.

Character and Appearance

Policy 32 and 33 of the HDPF seeks 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 14 of the SSW Neighbourhood Plan states that the scale, density, massing, height, landscape design, layout and materials of all development proposals, including alterations to existing buildings, will be required to reflect the architectural and historic character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape.

The application relates to a detached two storey dwelling sited on the northern side of Hormare Crescent, Storrington. The dwelling is composed of a stock brick facing to all elevations, including a

pitched roof finished with pantiles, and hosts a single storey flat roof garage to the eastern elevation. The surrounding area is characterised by similar detached two-storey dwellings of a similar age and style to the application site. There are no formal boundary treatments bordering along the eastern and western frontage. The proposal seeks permission to erect a part single part two storey side extension. The proposed plans indicate the addition of fenestration to the front and rear of the property.

The surrounding properties are similar in form, scale and design, it is noted that the neighbouring property to the western elevation 102 Hormare Crescent, received a similar planning permission under planning Ref: SR/25/03 and in this context, and given the limited contribution the building makes to the street scene, it is considered that the development would not have any adverse impact on the character or appearance of the site or the wider surrounding area.

Whilst the presence of a two storey addition to the side of a property may be perceived as domineering and adds a somewhat additional bulk/form to the side elevation from the submitted plans when placed in the wider scenery the proposed development, the extension is considered to be of a scale and design that is sympathetic and subservient to the site and immediate surrounds, with adequate set back from the principle elevation of the dwelling and ridge of the main roof. The proposal whilst different in appearance to neighbouring property to the east fit the form and scale of the property to the west, with the use of similar materials it is therefore considered to reflect the form and scale of the existing building and would appear as a coherent and sympathetic addition to the property. Having no detrimental impact on the host property or surrounding area. The visual impact of the proposal is therefore considered acceptable and would accord with the above policies.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) seeks to ensure that developments do not result in unacceptable harm to the amenity of occupiers of nearby properties or land. The proposed extension at 104 Hormare Crescent has been assessed with regard to its impact on neighbouring properties, especially in light of the representation received from the adjacent property at 106 Hormare Crescent.

Trespass and Encroachment: The objection raises concerns that parts of the extension, such as the roof and guttering, would overhang the boundary, potentially constituting a legal trespass. While planning permission does not address civil matters like trespass, it is acknowledged that the applicant must ensure compliance with civil laws, and it is recommended that the applicant reviews the plans to ensure no parts of the extension encroach onto neighbouring land. Nonetheless, the planning authority can only assess the extension based on its impact on the immediate physical and visual environment, and in this case, the siting and proximity of the development within the property boundary appears to adhere to planning regulations.

Loss of Light and Views: The objector has expressed concern over a potential loss of light and the closing of the gap between the properties. Policy 33 does take into account the effects on light and overshadowing, but it must be noted that the proposed extension is set back from the main ridge of the house and is designed to be subservient to the existing structure. The scale and positioning of the extension, while reducing some of the gap between the properties, is not considered to result in a significant or unacceptable loss of light, particularly given the orientation of the houses and the existing spacing. Any loss of views would be oblique and therefore minimal at worst, thus would not constitute a reasonable planning reason to refuse the permission.

Privacy and Noise: The objection highlights concern about noise during construction and a potential loss of privacy due to the proximity of workmen and the reduced gap between the houses. While noise during construction can be disruptive, it is generally considered a temporary issue. Regarding privacy, the design of the extension has been carefully considered, with minimal impact on overlooking or direct views into the neighbouring property. The proposed fenestration would not result in any increase opportunity of overlooking over and above the existing arrangement, and given the proposal would remain within the footprint of the existing dwelling (and general building line to the neighbour) would not result in adverse overshadowing.

Environmental and Structural Concerns: Concerns were raised about the potential impact on local wildlife and the structural integrity of the boundary wall. Given the site's location within the built-up area boundary, within an established residential street, the ecological value of the site is not considered significant thus the proposed extension would not likely result in adverse ecological harm. In addition, there is no evidence to suggest that the structural concerns related to the boundary wall would be exacerbated by the proposed extension, provided that all construction adheres to current building regulations. The applicant should be advised to carry out appropriate structural surveys to ensure the integrity of both properties is maintained.

Overdevelopment: The representation suggests that the extension contributes to overdevelopment, altering the character of the area by favouring larger homes. Policy 33 requires that developments be appropriate in scale and mass to their surroundings. In this case, the extension demonstrates suitable subservience and is appropriately designed, similar in character and appearance to existing development on the street (e.g., at 102 Hormare Crescent under planning ref: SR/25/03). The development therefore does not constitute an overdevelopment of the site, as the overall massing remains in keeping with the character of the area and does not overwhelm the property or the street scene.

Conclusion on Amenity: Taking into account the relevant policies and the objections raised, it is considered that the proposed extension at 104 Hormare Crescent has been designed in a way that minimizes harm to the neighbouring property. The scale, design, and positioning of the extension are such that the amenity of 106 Hormare Crescent would not be unacceptably compromised. In addition the proposed extension is sited and orientated in a way to avoid harm to neighbouring amenity to properties to the rear (facing north). The proposal therefore accords with Policy 33 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 180 and the Council's obligations under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

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 application form and approved plans.

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/24/1222

Schedule of plans/documents **approved**:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Elevation & Floor plan	Existing and roof	24/1581/01	13.08.2024
Elevation & Floor plan	Proposed and roof	24/1581/02	13.08.2024
Location plan		NONE	13.08.2024
Block plan		NONE	13.08.2024

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Shazia Penne Date: 01.10.2024

Authorising Officer sign/initial RHERMITAGE Date: 08.10.2024