Horsham District Council

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

OFFICER CHECKLIST	
WEEK ONE (Date Valid)	**13th November 2025**
Check Neighbours	x
Check Consultations (including newts) / Press List	x
Check Description, Plans and Supporting Documents	x
Print and Display Site Notice (if required)	☐
WEEK TWO (+7)	**20th November 2025**
Visit Site or request site visit photos (in accordance with Site Visit Guidance Note)	x
Draft HRA / AA if necessary. If the water statement is insufficient discuss with TL / PPO whether to discuss / accept amendments to the strategy.	☐
Instruct Legal if s106 required (with prior TL / PPO agreement)	☐
WEEK THREE (+14)	**27th November 2025**
If amendments are likely to be needed discuss with TL / PPO (N.B. Only minor amendments will be accepted in accordance with the Amendment Guidance). When requesting amendments give clear deadline (i.e. start of week 5).	☐
WEEK FOUR (+21)	**4th December 2025**
If no amendments required, contact agent / applicant with update on progress.	**x**
Confirm whether delegated or committee decision (re: parish and neighbour representations)	**x**
WEEK FIVE (+28)	**11th December 2025**
14-day re-consultation letters to be sent on any amended plans	☐
Prepare draft report	☐
WEEK SIX (+35)	**18th December 2025**
Check 35-day Cllr call-in for Committee	**x**
If decision based on original plans, report to be drafted and submitted for sign off	**x**
WEEK SEVEN (+42)	**25th December 2025**
If decision based on amended plans, report to be drafted and submitted for sign off	☐
Reason for EOT	☐

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/25/1862
4 The Green , Old Guildford Road, Broadbridge Heath, West Sussex, RH12 3JY

DESCRIPTION:

Erection of a rear dormer extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/25/0947 Erection of two-storey front and side extensions, with extension of roof to create additional accommodation. Application Permitted on 01.08.2025

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

The application site comprises a link-detached two storey dwelling located on the southern side of The Green, Old Guildford Road, within the built up area of Horsham, and within a residential setting where the houses numbered 1 to 4 The Green, are of similar character and age and considered to contribute positively to the character of the area.

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

Neighbourhood Plan:
Broadbridge Heath has not been designated as a Neighbourhood Plan area.

Horsham District Local Plan (2023-40) (Regulation 19):
Strategic Policy 19: Development Quality
Strategic Policy 20: Development Principles

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:

Parish Comments:

Broadbridge Heath Parish Council: neither objecting nor supporting the application, however made the following comments:-

- The current building appears to have been completed to a high standard but is not in a style that is sympathetic to, or blends with the surrounding properties, in particular the rear elevation and revised roof line.
- The roof has been remodelled and the house is now in effect three storeys. There is a flat roof to the rear, with normal sized casement windows which appear as though they may overlook properties to the rear (south).
- The Parish Council notes the current letter of objection and is concerned with the potential effect on neighbouring properties and maintaining the character of the building and surrounding area.

Representations:

4 letters of Objection have been received from 3 addresses, objecting to the application on the following grounds:

- The dormer extension is not in keeping with the character of surrounding properties and appears intrusive when viewed from neighbouring gardens and windows.
- The combination of brickwork and dark cladding creates a stark contrast with the traditional red brick and pitched roof aesthetic of the area, giving the appearance of two mismatched structures or an industrial/static unit.
- The large flat roof removes any remnants of the original pitched roof style, which is inconsistent with the village character.
- The scale and massing of the dormer extension are excessive compared to typical dormer additions in the locality, resulting in a dominant and disproportionate form.

- The installation of vertical windows (instead of Velux rooflights as originally approved) significantly increases overlooking into neighbouring gardens and rear-facing rooms.
- Reflections from the cladding and windows cause glare into neighbouring properties at certain times of day.
- The extension reduces outlook and blocks views of trees and open space from neighbouring upper-floor rooms.
- The use of dark grey cladding and white guttering contrasts sharply with the prevailing materials (red brick, cream render, black guttering, and tiled roofs), making the extension visually obtrusive.
- The extension appears to have been constructed prior to formal approval, and the built form does not match the originally approved plans (which included Velux rooflights rather than vertical windows).

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

The application has been assessed on the basis of a site visit and 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.

Design 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.

The application relates to a rear dormer extension that would extend across the breadth of the roof slope, where the development has been clad in vertical weatherboarding. As part of the development, the side of the dwelling, to first floor level, has also been clad in vertical weatherboarding. The development has been carried out and completed, and the application is therefore retrospective.

The rear box dormer occupies the majority of the rear roof slope and, due to its size, flat-roofed form, extensive cladding, and window arrangement, introduces significant bulk and massing that appears overly dominant and unsympathetic to the host dwelling. The proportions and flat-roofed design create the impression of a full third storey rather than a typical loft conversion, disrupting the balance and symmetry of the original building and creating a top-heavy appearance that contrasts sharply with the prevailing pitched roof profiles that define the character of the surrounding area.

While it is acknowledged that there are examples of rear dormers on neighbouring properties, these are considerably smaller and sit as subservient additions within the roof slope. In contrast, the dormer at 4 The Green would be substantially larger and more visually intrusive, utilising a flat roof box design that would over-dominate and off-balance the host dwelling. This would be further exaggerated by the vertical weatherboarding which not only contrasts the established materials of the dwelling but further emphasises the resulting verticality.

Whilst it is recognised that the dormer would be of a cubic volume that would accord with the permitted development volume measurements, the development has not utilised similar materials and has not been designed to be set back from the eaves. The development does not therefore represent permitted development, where this is not considered to represent a viable fallback.

For these reasons, the dormer extension is considered to be of a scale, design, and form that would result in a poor quality design which would over-dominate and be disproportionate to the host dwelling. The development results in a top-heavy appearance that off-balances the host dwelling, with the materials considered to contrast the recognised material palette and further exaggerate the scale and massing of the development. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF.

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.

It is recognised that objections have been received with respect to overlooking and loss of privacy caused by the development. Whilst recognised that the development increases the verticality of the building and subsequently the perception of overlooking, the actual impact would be similar to other dormer development within the locality, where a degree of mutual overlooking is anticipated and accepted. It is not therefore considered that a refusal reason for amenity impact would be justified.

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

It is considered that the completed works has failed to respect or complement the existing building and the wider street scene and results in harm to the character and appearance of the host property and wider locality. The development is therefore considered to be contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason(s) for Refusal:

1. The scale, design, form and resulting massing of the dormer results in a poor quality development that is disproportionate to the host dwelling, and results in a top-heavy appearance and cluttered roofscape that increases the perceived dominance and verticality of the built form. The development therefore fails to relate sympathetically to the character and visual amenity of the host dwelling and surroundings, contrary to Policies 32, and 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/25/1862
Schedule of plans/documents **not approved**:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Elevation plan	Proposed Elevations	AD06 Rev A	24.11.2025
Roof plan	Proposed Second/Loft Dormer Floor & Roof Plan & Dormer Cubic Meter Study	AD05 Rev A	24.11.2025
Location & Block plan	Site/Block Location Plans & Existing Approved Ground Floor Plan	AD01	13.11.2025
Floor plan	Proposed Ground & Second Floor Plan	AD04	13.11.2025
Elevation plan	Existing Elevations	AD03	13.11.2025
Floor plan	Existing As Approved First/Loft Floor & Roof Plan	AD02	13.11.2025

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Marie Riggs Date: 02.01.2026

Authorising Officer sign/initial ..... Date: .....