Horsham District Council

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

OFFICER CHECKLIST	
WEEK ONE (Date Valid)	**10th December 2024**
Check Neighbours	Y
Check Consultations (including newts) / Press List	Y
Check Description, Plans and Supporting Documents	Y
Print and Display Site Notice (if required)	N/A
WEEK TWO (+7)	**17th December 2024**
Visit Site or request site visit photos (in accordance with Site Visit Guidance Note)	Y
Draft HRA / AA if necessary. If the water statement is insufficient discuss with TL / PPO whether to discuss / accept amendments to the strategy.	N/A
Instruct Legal if s106 required (with prior TL / PPO agreement)	N/A
WEEK THREE (+14)	**24th December 2024**
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).	**N/A**
WEEK FOUR (+21)	**31st December 2024**
If no amendments required, contact agent / applicant with update on progress.	**N**
Confirm whether delegated or committee decision (re: parish and neighbour representations)	**DEL**
WEEK FIVE (+28)	**7th January 2025**
14-day re-consultation letters to be sent on any amended plans	**N/A**
Prepare draft report	**Y**
WEEK SIX (+35)	**14th January 2025**
Check 35-day Cllr call-in for Committee	**Y**
If decision based on original plans, report to be drafted and submitted for sign off	**Y**
WEEK SEVEN (+42)	**21st January 2025**
If decision based on amended plans, report to be drafted and submitted for sign off	**N/A**
Reason for EOT	**N/A**

APPLICATION NO./ADDRESS:

DC/24/1922
29 Kings Stone Avenue, Steyning, West Sussex, BN44 3FJ

DESCRIPTION:

Demolition of existing side garage and erection of a two storey side and rear extension. Installation of three rooflights to the front elevation.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

DC/24/1349	Demolition of existing side garage and erection of a two storey side and rear extension. Installation of three	Application Refused on 20.11.2024

	rooflights to front elevation.	
UB/61/61	Provision of additional two rooms in roof space Comment: B.regs (From old Planning History)	Application Permitted on 06.12.1961

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 Development Plan 2019-2031:
SNDP2- Responsible Environmental Design
SNDP3- Contribution to Character

Horsham District Local Plan (2023-40) (Regulation 19):
Policy 9: Water Neutrality
Policy 17: Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity
Policy 19: Development Quality
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:

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:

Steyning Parish Council objects to this proposed development with the following concerns:

- The proposed development would result in overdevelopment of a chalet bungalow which would be intrusive to neighbours
- The proposed development would be too close to the boundary

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

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.

Policy SNDP2 and SNDP3 of the SNDP requires development to be appropriate to their scale and nature to promote responsible environmental design, as well as to respond positively and sensitively to the scale, mass, height, building materials and form of neighbouring properties.

The application site comprises a semi-detached bungalow which lies within the settlement boundary of Steyning. The surrounding area features a variety of building forms, with two-storey terraced housing to the north and semi-detached and detached bungalows to the south, with various later extensions and alterations visible from the highway.

This application proposes demolition of the existing side garage and for the erection of a two-storey flat roof side extension, with its ground floor extension extending 5 metres from the existing rear elevation, and its first-floor extension extending 3 metres from the existing rear elevation. The scheme also includes a single-storey rear extension and a flat-roofed rear dormer, with both attached to the proposed two-storey side extension.

Previous application DC/24/1349 was refused on the grounds of scale, massing and design of the proposal not being sympathetic to the form or proportions of the host building, which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

There is no objection in principle to extending the existing property in order to create additional living accommodation on the site. However, there are concerns over the massing and design approach of this proposed development. The design and massing of the proposed two-storey flat-roofed side extension would appear significantly different to that of the existing semi-detached bungalow, and parts of such extension would also be visible from the highway. This would significantly alter the existing form and proportions of the host dwelling and is not considered sympathetic to the character of the dwellinghouse.

Even though this proposal involves a retention of a small part of the existing rear roof, a majority of the existing rear roof and all of the existing eaves of the rear roof would be removed by the proposed single-storey rear extension and rear dormer, along with the two-storey side extension. This proposed development would appear intrusive and dominant to the host dwelling, and would significantly detract the semi-detached bungalow of its existing form and character.

It is noted that the application site neighbours a two-storey terraced row of properties, and there is a variation of built form along the road. However, dwellinghouses with different built forms in the surrounding are physically detached from each other.

The proposed two-storey flat-roofed side extension would resemble a two-storey flat-roofed building fully attached to the side of the existing bungalow. It would be visible from the highway and would significantly contrast the existing principal elevation, and those within the wider surroundings.

It is considered that the proposal, by reason of its design and mass, would be an incongruous addition to the existing dwellinghouse and would not be sympathetic to the prevailing character of the dwellinghouse. The development, in addition, would not relate sympathetically to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF, and Policy SNDP3 of the SNDP.

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.

Policy SNDP3 seeks to ensure development contributes positively towards the character of Steyning through respecting neighbouring amenity.

The ground floor of the proposal would extend a maximum of 5 metres from the existing rear elevation, whilst the first floor of the proposal would extend a maximum of 3 metres. The adjoining property (within the pair of semi-detached bungalows) has been previously extended to the rear and the presence of this extension would largely mitigate any potential unacceptable impacts arising from the proposed rear extension. The neighbouring end-terrace property to the north of the site, which sits on a different orientation, would not experience an unacceptable impact to overshadowing.

There is a degree of mutual overlooking between properties. While the proposal would introduce new openings at first floor level, the resulting arrangement would not be unusual or unexpected in an established residential location such as this, and as such no unacceptable loss of privacy would result. It is considered this proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity.

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 (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.

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

The proposal is not considered to comply with relevant local and national planning policies and is therefore recommended for refusal.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason(s) for Refusal:

1. The development, by reason of its design and mass, is not considered to be sympathetic to the prevailing character or proportions of the host building and would off-balance the pair of semi-detached dwellings of which the application site forms part. The development would be an incongruous addition and appear intrusive and overbearing, resulting in harm to the built character and visual amenity of the site and surrounding area. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy SNDP3 of the Steyning Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019-2031.

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/24/1922
Schedule of plans/documents **not approved**:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Elevation plan	Proposed Elevations	A 445-8_2	10.12.2024
Plans	Rear 3D Visual	A 445-9_2	10.12.2024
Block plan	Block Plan	A 445-10_2	10.12.2024
Floor plan	Existing GF Plan	A 445-1_2	10.12.2024
Floor plan	Proposed GF Plan	A 445-2_2	10.12.2024
Floor plan	Existing 1F Plan	A 445-3_2	10.12.2024
Floor plan	Proposed 1F Plan	A 445-4_2	10.12.2024
Roof plan	Existing Roof Plan	A 445-5_2	10.12.2024
Roof plan	Proposed Roof Plan	A 445-6_2	10.12.2024
Elevation plan	Existing Elevations	A 445-7_2	10.12.2024
Location plan		NONE	10.12.2024

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Joshua Lee Date: 30.01.2025

Authorising Officer sign/initial Tamara Dale Date: 03.02.2025