Horsham District Council

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:
DC/24/0493
16 Church Mead, Steyning, West Sussex, BN44 3ST

DESCRIPTION:
Erection of a single storey rear extension

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

ST/52/99	1st floor side extension Site: 16 Church Mead Steyning	Application Permitted on 17.09.1999.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES
The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):
Policy 31- Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 32- Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33- Development Principles

Steyning Neighbourhood Plan (2019-2031):
SNDP3 – Contribution to Character

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:
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
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 supplied by the agent. These details were considered sufficient to allow the application to be properly considered and determined.

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.

16 Church Mead is a detached dwelling located within the built-up area of Steyning. The application seeks planning permission to erect a single storey rear extension. The extension would sit on the rear, extending 3.7m from the rear elevation, and 3.45m across. The extension would sit close to the north-west boundary, close to the neighbouring dwelling 18 Church Mead. Regarding the design, the extension would be square-shaped and have a flat roof, with an innovative double-glazed frameless corner window, providing some visual interest to the extension. The materials would match those on the existing dwellinghouse and would therefore be in keeping with the surrounding built environment, where the presence of flat roofs to the rear would not be unexpected. It is noted that while the height of the extension may appear prominent on the rear elevation, the extension would not be visible from the street scene and in views from the rear would be clearly subservient to the main dwelling. The extension would be comfortably accommodated within the residential curtilage and would not be visible from the wider street scene, and it is considered that on balance, there would be no harmful visual or amenity impacts.

The proposal is considered to be of a design, form and scale which is appropriate to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, and which would not harm the character or appearance of the wider area. It is therefore considered that the visual impact of the proposal is 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 proposed extension would sit close to the shared boundary with the western neighbour, which features a single-storey side and rear extension (with no window openings to the flank elevation). It is considered the additional projection beyond the rear of the neighbour together with the retained separation and existing boundary treatment would be sufficient to reduce the resulting impact, such that no unacceptable harm would arise.

It is therefore 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, in accordance with the above policy. It is noted that no representation letters have been received.

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/24/0493
(The approved plans will form Condition 1 on the Decision Notice of all Permitted applications)

Schedule of plans/documents **approved**:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Location & Block plan	As existing	1.01 REV B	11.04.2024
Location & Block plan	As proposed	2.01 REV B	11.04.2024
Floor plan	As existing	1.03	28.03.2024
Elevation plan	As existing	1.04	28.03.2024
Floor plan	As proposed	2.02	28.03.2024

Elevation plan	As proposed	2.03	28.03.2024
Plans	Topographical Survey	1.02	28.03.2024
Supporting Docs	Application Form	NONE	28.03.2024

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Bethan Tinning Date: 28.05.2024

Authorising Officer sign/initial Guy Everest Date: 06.06.2024