Horsham District Council

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/26/1287
Brookside Farm, Little Orchard , Dagbrook Lane, Henfield, West Sussex, BN5 9SH

DESCRIPTION:

Demolition of existing single storey dwelling and erection of new 2-storey dwelling.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/21/1981	Erection of a single storey side and rear extension (Lawful Development Certificate - Proposed).	Application Permitted on 21.10.2021
DC/21/2018	Prior approval for the enlargement of an existing dwellinghouse by addition of an additional storey resulting in an increase in height of 2.7m	Prior Approval Required and PERMITTED on 05.04.2022
DC/25/0753	Prior Approval for the enlargement of existing dwellinghouse thorough the erection of an additional storey resulting in an increase of height of 2.7m.	Prior Approval Required and PERMITTED on 01.07.2025

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

The application site is located in the rural countryside outside of any defined built up area boundary. The site is accessed via a private lane from the A2037 and is on the south side of Dagbook Lane.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

The application seeks permission for a replacement dwelling within a similar siting. The approximate measurements of the proposed dwelling would be 8.2 metres ridge height, eaves height 5.51 metres, width of 22.3 metres and a depth of 17.25 metres. When including the various terraces the total floorspace would be approximately 479 square metres.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):
Policy 1 - Strategic Policy: Sustainable Development
Policy 2 - Strategic Policy: Strategic Development
Policy 3 - Strategic Policy: Development Hierarchy
Policy 4 - Strategic Policy: Settlement Expansion
Policy 15 - Strategic Policy: Housing Provision
Policy 24 - Strategic Policy: Environmental Protection
Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Policy 26 - Strategic Policy: Countryside Protection
Policy 31 - Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33 - Development Principles

Policy 35 - Strategic Policy: Climate Change
Policy 36 - Strategic Policy: Appropriate Energy Use
Policy 37 - Sustainable Construction
Policy 38 - Strategic Policy: Flooding
Policy 39 - Strategic Policy: Infrastructure Provision
Policy 40 - Sustainable Transport
Policy 41 - Parking
Policy 28 - Replacement Dwellings and House Extensions in the Countryside

Henfield Neighbourhood plan 2017-2031
Policy 1: A spatial plan
Policy 2: Housing site allocations
Policy 12: Design standards for development

Henfield Parish Design Statement

Horsham District Local Plan (2023-40) (Regulation 19):
Strategic Policy 1: Sustainable Development
Strategic Policy 2: Development Hierarchy
Strategic Policy 3: Settlement Expansion
Strategic Policy 6: Climate Change
Strategic Policy 7: Appropriate Energy Use
Strategic Policy 8: Sustainable Design and Construction
Strategic Policy 9: Water Neutrality
Strategic Policy 10: Flooding
Strategic Policy 11: Environmental Protection
Strategic Policy 13: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Strategic Policy 14: Countryside Protection
Strategic Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Strategic Policy 19: Development Quality
Strategic Policy 20: Development Principles
Strategic Policy 24: Sustainable Transport
Policy 25: Parking
Strategic Policy 37: Housing Provision
Strategic Policy 38: Meeting Local Housing Needs
Policy 40: Improving Housing Standards in the District

Supplementary Planning Guidance:
Planning Obligations and Affordable Housing SPD (2017)
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule (2017)

Planning Advice Notes:
Facilitating Appropriate Development
Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure

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 Arboricultural Officer: Comment

The application has not been submitted with a measured tree survey. There are no individual trees present on or immediately adjacent to the site that would be considered to be significant constraints on site development. No significant arboricultural concerns. The rectangular plot is bounded by hedging with some scattered domestic scale trees within the site itself. The largest tree, to the east of the proposed build footprint, is a twin stemmed oak of early maturity. Whilst not directly impacted upon by

the excavations for foundations and associated hardstanding proposed, it is unlikely that the tree will be desired for longer term retention within a re-designed garden accompanying the larger build footprint proposed.

Ecology Consultant: Objection

Place Services maintains a holding objection to the application on the basis that insufficient information has been provided regarding the site's trees and their potential to support bats, which are European Protected Species. Whilst the submitted bat surveys are accepted in relation to the buildings, demonstrating that no further bat surveys of the buildings are required, it remains unclear whether any trees will be removed as no arboricultural report has been submitted. Any trees proposed for removal should be subject to a Ground Level Tree Assessment, with further surveys, mitigation, compensation and a precautionary method statement provided where Potential Roost Features are identified. This information is required prior to determination to enable the Council to properly assess impacts on protected species and comply with its statutory duties.

Notwithstanding this objection, Place Services supports the proposed precautionary measures for reptiles, amphibians and hedgehogs, the implementation of a wildlife-friendly lighting strategy for bats, and the proposed biodiversity enhancement measures, all of which should be secured by condition. Subject to the submission of the additional bat information relating to any affected trees, the consultee indicates that its holding objection could be overcome.

Southern Water: Comment

No means of drainage has been proposed such that insufficient information has been provided and therefore a condition would be required. If a new connection would be made with Southern Water then a legal agreement would be required.

WSCC Highways: No Objection

There are no proposed changes to the existing access arrangements. Dagbrook Lane adjoins the public highway at Shoreham Road, an A-classified road subject to a speed restriction of 40 mph in this location.

An inspection of collision data provided to WSCC by Sussex Police from a period of the last five years reveals one recorded collision within the vicinity of the existing access. However, this was not attributed to the use of the existing access. Therefore, there is no evidence to suggest the existing access has been operating unsafely, or that its continued use would exacerbate an existing safety concern.

As this application is for a replacement dwelling, the LHA does not anticipate that the proposed development would give rise to a significant material intensification of movements to or from the site.

Three car parking spaces will be provided on the existing drive. The WSCC Car Parking Demand Calculator indicates that a dwelling of this size in this location would require at least three car parking spaces. Therefore, the LHA is satisfied with the proposed level of parking provision.

From inspection of the plans, the driveway is suitably sized, and onsite turning appears achievable allowing cars to exit in a forward’s gear. No details have been provided regarding cycle parking; the LPA may wish to request cycle parking to promote sustainable transport options.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS:

Representations:

1 letter of Objection have been received, objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- Too big for the location and plot
- Roofline will overlook property and in particular privacy to the bedrooms
- Sewage drainage issues
- Seasonal overshadowing

Parish Comments:

Parish Council: Comment neither supporting nor objecting

This Committee does not have an objection in principle to the demolishing of the existing building but finds it difficult to give a positive response to the new building without knowing e.g. the height of the building and pitch of the roof. The Committee believes the application lacked clarity in its presentation and was missing important detail, so could not properly consider the application.

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

Principle of Development:

The application site is located outside of any defined built-up area boundary and is therefore within the countryside in policy terms.

Policy 28 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) states that outside the defined built-up areas, replacement dwellings and ancillary accommodation will be supported if the development can be accommodated appropriately within the curtilage of the existing dwelling. In addition, replacement dwellings will only be supported on a one for one basis and if it can be demonstrated that the property is not derelict. Replacement dwellings should not be disproportionate to the size of the existing dwelling, whilst extensions should also, and in addition, be in keeping with the scale and character of the existing dwelling.

The application site comprises a single storey dwelling, albeit that it is recognised that the site is subject of a Prior Approval consent under DC/25/0753 to enlarge the dwelling by way of an additional storey. The approved dwelling would amount to a total floorspace of approximately 220sqm, where this extant fallback position is a significant material consideration.

The proposed development would amount to a ground floor footprint of 244sqm, with the first floor amounting to an additional 150sqm above this. Compared to the fallback position, the proposal would result in a 96% increase in footprint, where this would be considered disproportionate to the Prior Approval consent and consequently the existing dwelling (where the proposal would amount to an increase of approximately 292%). On this basis, the proposal would be in some conflict with Policy 28 of the HDPF.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed dwelling would sit comfortably within the existing curtilage, the proposed dwelling would be disproportionate to the existing dwelling and the Prior Approval consent. The development would therefore be in some conflict with Policy 28 of the HDPF. The weight to be afforded this conflict will be discussed in greater detail within the Planning Balance and Conclusions section below.

Design and Appearance:

Policies 25, 32, and 33 of the HDPF promote development that protects, conserves and enhances the landscape and townscape character from inappropriate development. Proposals should take into account townscape characteristics, with development seeking to provide an attractive, functional and accessible environment that complements the locally distinctive character of the district. Buildings should contribute to a sense of place, and should be of a scale, massing, and appearance that is of a high standard or design and layout which relates sympathetically to the landscape and built surroundings.

Policy 12 of the Henfield Neighbourhood plan states that development proposals should comply with the following criteria:-

a. The design respects the amenities of occupiers/users of nearby property and land.
b. The design achieves satisfactory access without harming the amenities of neighbouring properties and residents.
c. The scale, density, massing, height, landscape design, layout and materials of all development proposals, including alterations to existing buildings, are of a high quality and reflect the architectural and historic character and the scale of the surrounding buildings and street-scene/ landscape.
d. The design preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Henfield Conservation Area and/or preserves any adjacent listed buildings and its setting.

DP3 States principles for well-designed places where development proposals should respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings; such as through the arrangement of development plots and buildings, the use of materials and architectural features. This should not preclude innovation or change where appropriate, especially where an increased scale or density of development is justified in accordance with policies L2 and L3.

DP3 3. States that: 3. Development proposals should be refused if, without clear justification, they conflict with paragraph 1 of this policy or relevant aspects of the principles in paragraph 2, or with any explicit design standards set out in the development plan (including those in locally specific policies, guides, codes or masterplans). Substantial weight should be given to compliance with relevant development plan policies when assessing the design quality of proposals.

The context of development in this location is traditional rural dwellings with traditional materials, where there are some limited more modern appearances. There are very limited non-traditional materials or roof forms and glazing is more limited that shown in the proposed elevations.

The proposed materials would include extensive vertical zinc cladding, black painted vertical timber, a Staffordshire blue engineering brick (concrete grey colour) and extensive back aluminium framed glazing, with the single storey element having a glass balustrade. The materials and extent of glazing proposed would be decidedly out of character for the immediate locality and when considered with the increased footprint and form, would result in a poorly integrated development that would be out of character with the scale and appearance of the surrounding rural area. The development proposed would result in an urban appearance with little that can be said to reflect the locality in terms of its architectural features. When considered in combination, the proposed development would harm the sense of place and distinctive character of the area.

It is noted that the application has been made in the presence of a fallback position which would result in the existing dwelling being increased by up to an additional 2.7 metres, however the materials would have matched the existing dwellinghouse and would not have included a side window on any side elevation.

It was noted in the officer report at the time "*The resulting external appearance of the dwelling, particularly the principal elevation, would closely resemble that of the existing property. The roof design and pitch, window size and style, as well as the external materials, are all proposed to match the existing dwelling. Additionally, the side elevations do not face a highway.*"

The proposed development is considered to present a level of harm from the use of materials in this location that would not be present as part of the fallback position, and the fallback position would therefore be a better form of development that would not be overly prominent, obtrusive or incongruent with the character of the site and locality.

The prominent and incongruous appearance of the proposed development would not be limited to the use of materials but the combined impact from the form, design, materials and scale. Even when accounting for the fallback position which would allow an increase in height when compared to the existing dwelling, the proposed development is considered to be of a poor design and visual quality in this context, where the proposal would appear as a prominent feature within the landscape. The limited visual relief, stark elevations and angular appearance would exaggerate the overall massing and bulk of the built form, and the proposal would fail to reflect the built character and architectural features of the wider locality. The proposal would therefore not accord with the key principles of well-designed places outlined within DP3 of the NPPF.

It is therefore considered that the proposed development would be contrary to Policies 25, 32, and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy 12 of the Henfield Neighbourhood plan. As per part 3 of DP3 of the NPPF substantial weight is afforded to the conflict with the development plan. There is no identifiable benefit that would outweigh the harm as identified.

Residential Amenity:

Policy 32 of the HDPF states that development will be expected to provide an attractive, functional, accessible, safe, and adaptable environment that contribute a sense of place both in the buildings and spaces themselves. Policy 33 continues that development shall be required to ensure that it is designed to avoid unacceptable harm to the amenity of occupiers/users of nearby property and land.

There are dwellings to the north and west of the application site. There is an acceptable distance between the proposed dwelling and the surrounding dwellings when considering the presence of the fallback position and that the new opening at first floor level to the west would be glazed. There would be an increase in the number of openings at first floor level with a terrace that would overlook the property to the north. This view would increase the perception of overlooking to the properties to the north to some small degree, however there are a number of trees along the site boundary as shown on the submitted Block Plan and there are windows at first floor capable under the fallback position such that there would not be an unacceptable impact in this regard.

When compared to the fallback position already approved within the application site, the proposal would not give rise to unacceptable amenity impacts such that there are no objections to the application in light of policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF.

Highways Impacts:

Policies 40 and 41 of the HDPF promote development that provides safe and adequate access, suitable for all users.

The proposed dwelling would utilise the existing access. WSCC have been consulted during the course of the application and have no concerns of safety issues. It was further considered that due to the scale of development, the dwelling would not generate significant additional traffic or materially affect highway safety.

Overall, there are no Highways concerns and no objection to the proposal on the basis of policies 40 and 41 of the HDPF.

Ecology:

Policy 31 of the HDPF states that development will be supported where it demonstrates that it maintains or enhances the existing network of green infrastructure. Development proposals will be

required to contribute to the enhancement of existing biodiversity and should create and manage new habitats where appropriate.

Circular 06/2005 identifies that the presence of protected species is a material consideration when considering a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat. Therefore, it is essential that the presence or otherwise of protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by the proposed application, is established before planning permission is granted. Information on biodiversity impacts and opportunities should inform all stages of development, and an ecological survey is usually necessary where the type and location of development are such that the impact on biodiversity may be significant and existing information is lacking or inadequate.

Place services have objected to the development due to insufficient information in terms of whether any trees will be removed as no arboricultural report has been submitted. Since this time, the applicant has submitted a further block plan which demonstrates that none of the existing trees would be removed and new native trees would be proposed. Therefore no Ground Level Tree Assessment would be required. Overall, given the submitted amendments, there are no objections to the proposal subject to a precautionary method statement being provided where Potential Roost Features are identified.

Climate Change:

Policies 35, 36 and 37 require that development mitigates to the impacts of climate change through measures including improved energy efficiency, reducing flood risk, reducing water consumption, improving biodiversity and promoting sustainable transport modes. These policies reflect the requirements of the NPPF that local plans and decisions seek to reduce the impact of development on climate change.

Should the proposed development be approved, the following measures to build resilience to climate change and reduce carbon emissions would be secured by condition:

- Water consumption limited to 110litres per person per day
- Requirement to provide full fibre broadband site connectivity
- Dedicated refuse and recycling storage capacity
- Electric vehicle charging points

Subject to these conditions, the application will suitably reduce the impact of the development on climate change in accordance with local and national policy.

Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG):

Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as inserted by Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 2021) mandates that every development must achieve at least a 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG (unless the development qualifies as exempt under the Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Exemptions) Regulations 2024) and that every planning permission granted for the development of land in England shall be deemed to have been granted subject to the condition that development must not be begun unless a Biodiversity Gain Plan has been submitted to the planning authority and the planning authority has approved the Plan.

The Biodiversity Gain Plan must show how the development will achieve the required minimum 10% BNG using the statutory biodiversity metric tool, and must demonstrate how the habitats will be managed and maintained for 30 years, starting from the date the development is completed. Off-site gains (on unregistered sites) and significant on-site enhancements will be secured over this period by way of a Legal Agreement.

The applicant has outlined within their submission that the land within the red line boundary would be less than 0.2 hectares. The proposal is therefore exempt from mandatory BNG requirements.

Planning Balance and Conclusions:

The proposed replacement dwelling is not considered acceptable in principle. Although significant weight is afforded to the fallback position established under prior approval reference DC/25/0753, the proposed dwelling would nevertheless represent a disproportionate increase in scale, footprint and massing compared to both the original dwelling and the approved fallback scheme. The contemporary design, extensive glazing and incongruent materials would appear at odds within the rural context, resulting in a prominent and urbanising form of development that would fail to respect the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside.

The proposal would not therefore be in accordance with the principle outlined in DP3 of the NPPF for well-designed places. In accordance with the provisions of DP3 the harm identified would be afforded substantial weight due to the conflict with the development plan policies.

While no objections are raised in respect of residential amenity, highways, ecology, climate change or biodiversity net gain, these considerations do not outweigh the identified harm. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Policies 25, 28, 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), Policy 12 of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan, and Policy S5(c) and Policy DP3 of the NPPF (2026), and planning permission is therefore recommended for refusal.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason for Refusal:

1 The proposed development would be of a poor design and visual quality, where the proposal would appear as a prominent feature that would fail to reflect the built characteristics and context of the site and surroundings. The proposal would utilise materials, design, and form that when considered cumulatively, would fail to integrate with and relate sympathetically to the wider locality. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policies 25, 32, and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy DP3 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026).

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/26/1287
Schedule of plans/documents **not approved**:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Location & Block plan	Existing Plans	2504LI_R0_000 REV 000	11.08.2026
Location plan	Existing Location Plan	2301LI_000	11.08.2026
Block plan	Approved	2301LI_001	11.08.2026
Floor plan	Proposed Block Plan + Ground Floor Plan	2301LI_002	11.08.2026
Floor plan	Proposed Block Plan + First Floor Plan	2301LI_003	11.08.2026
Roof plan	Proposed Block Plan + Roof Plan	2301LI_R3_004_R 1	21.10.2026
Floor plan	Proposed Ground Floor Plan	2301LI_200	11.08.2026

Floor plan	Proposed First Floor Plan	2301LI_201	11.08.2026
Roof plan	Proposed Roof Plan	2301LI_202	11.08.2026
Elevation plan	Proposed North & South	2301LI_203	11.08.2026
Elevation plan	Proposed East & West	2301LI_204	11.08.2026
Materials	Proposed Materials	2301LI_900	11.08.2026

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Hannah Darley Date: 21 October 2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial Tamara Dale Date: 21.10.2026