Horsham District Council

DELEGATED APPLICATIONS - ASSESSMENT SHEET

OFFICER CHECKLIST	
WEEK ONE (Date Valid)	**24th March 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)	x
WEEK TWO (+7)	**31st March 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.	N/A
Instruct Legal if s106 required (with prior TL / PPO agreement)	N/A
WEEK THREE (+14)	**7th April 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).	**x**
WEEK FOUR (+21)	**14th April 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)	**21st April 2025**
14-day re-consultation letters to be sent on any amended plans	**x**
Prepare draft report	**x**
WEEK SIX (+35)	**28th April 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)	**5th May 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/25/0453
The Old Paddock , Leechpond Hill, Lower Beeding, West Sussex, RH13 6NR

DESCRIPTION:

Demolition of existing redundant stables and construction of detached garage and storage building with room in the roof space. Erection of a two storey side extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

None

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Horsham District Planning Framework (2015):
Policy 25 - Strategic Policy: The Natural Environment and Landscape Character
Policy 28 - Replacement Dwellings and House Extensions in the Countryside
Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development
Policy 33 - Development Principles

Lower Beeding Parish Council
There is no made plan.

Horsham District Local Plan (2023-40) (Regulation 19):
Policy 9: Water Neutrality
Policy 19: Development Quality
Policy 20: Development Principles
Policy 45: Replacement Dwellings and House Extensions in the Countryside

Parish Design Statement:
None

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.

Arboricultural Officer: Comment

Do not consider that Silver Birch would be an appropriate replacement, would recommend that the new trees be planted further into the garden or elsewhere at the property.

Consideration should be given to replacing the birch with similar medium-sized trees. Recommended trees - Carpinus betulus (Hornbeam), Acer campestre (Field Maple, Ulmus ‘Lutèce’ (Naguen), Ulmus ‘New Horizon’, both DED-resistant species of Elm.

WSCC Highway: Comment

No alterations are proposed to the existing vehicular access arrangement. The proposed development is not anticipated to give rise to a material intensification of use of the existing access point.

A new detached garage building is proposed, and this appears suitably sized. On-site turning appears achievable within the site, allowing cars to exit in a forward gear.

In summary, the LHA does not consider that this proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety or result in 'severe' cumulative impacts on the operation of the highway network.

Newt Officer: Comment

It is considered that the proposed development would present a low risk to great crested newts and/or their habitats. However, as the development is within the red Impact Risk Zone, as modelled by district licence mapping, recommend that an informative be attached.

Parish Comments: Comment

Looks disproportionate in size to the main house

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

Character and Appearance

Policy 28 of the HDPF relates to house extensions and outbuildings in the countryside, stating that ancillary accommodation and garaging must demonstrate that the need for additional space cannot be met from an existing dwelling or buildings suitable of conversion on the site, with new outbuildings sited to have regard to the dwelling they serve and be grouped with the house. The policy also states that the use of ancillary accommodation as a separate dwelling will not be supported.

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 proposal would involve the demolition of an existing redundant stables and construction of detached garage and storage building with room in the roof space. Also, erection of a two-storey side extension.

The proposed two storey side extension would accommodate a lounge at ground floor level and an en-suite bedroom at first floor level. The proposed side extension is of reasonable scale and has been

designed to be in keeping with the main dwelling. Whilst incorporating a crown pitched roof, the proposal would reflect the form and features of the host dwelling and would sit comfortably within the curtilage. The proposed two storey extension is therefore considered acceptable.

The proposed detached garage would be positioned within the same footprint as the existing redundant 'L' shaped single storey stable block. The application site is partially screened by mature vegetation along the private drive which opens to a clear frontage opposite the stable block. Consequently, the application site is visible from wider views along this private drive.

The proposal would incorporate a 3-bay detached garage with implement store, cycle storage and a home / work office above. The proposed garage would comprise of an 'L' shaped one and a half storey hipped roof structure. The proposal would be minimally set down when viewed alongside the host dwelling, where the footprint and extent of development is considered to compete with the relatively modest dwelling. Whilst it is recognised that the proposal would replace an existing stable building, this is modestly proportioned at single storey and appears as a subservient and utilitarian building. In contrast, the proposed garage is considered to be of a bulk, mass and scale, including sprawling footprint and raised height, that would compete with the main dwelling. The proposed garage building lacks subservience to the host dwelling and would appear overbearing within context of the site surroundings. The siting would appear as a dominant addition and it is considered that the proposed detached garage would appear as a large and prominent structure visually intrusive to the immediate surroundings. This would be further exaggerated by the overall height and bulkiness of the outbuilding which would not appear as a subordinate addition to the host dwelling.

For these reasons, the proposed detached garage is considered to be of a scale, form, and mass that would result in an intrusive and overbearing addition to the frontage of the site, which would appear out of character with the visual amenities and character of the site and surroundings. The proposed detached garage is therefore considered to be in contrary to Policies 28, 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.

Due to the orientation of the site, it is considered that the siting and layout of the proposal and the resulting relationship with adjacent properties would be sufficient to prevent any unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity.

Tree impacts

Policy 26 seeks to maintain that development in the countryside protect, conserve and enhance the key features and characteristics of the landscape character area in which it is located including the pattern of woodlands, fields, hedgerows, trees, waterbodies and other features.

The proposal would include the removal of a mature Horse Chestnut Tree which makes a positive contribution to the landscape setting. The tree is visible to neighbouring properties and the upper crown is visible from the main road. There are no others in close proximity other than the off-site oak to the North.

Following consultation with the Council's Arboricultural Officer it is not considered that Silver Birch would be an appropriate replacement, even if two trees were to be planted. The reasoning behind this is that Silver Birch, once they reach maturity, do not take well to surgery, and this species of tree does not appear to be coping well with the hotter, drier weather in recent years. Also, it is noted that there is line of mature trees due south of where the new trees are proposed which may present issues with them establishing due to shade and competition. As such, it has been recommended that the new trees be planted further into the garden or elsewhere at the property. It is also advised that consideration should be given to replacing the birch with similar medium-sized trees. Recommended trees - Carpinus betulus (Hornbeam), Acer campestre (Field Maple, Ulmus 'Lutèce' (Naguen), Ulmus 'New Horizon', both DED-resistant species of Elm.

Had the application be considered acceptable in all other matters, it is considered that details of replacement trees could have been dealt with by condition.

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.

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

The proposal is considered to be contrary with the above-mentioned policies and guidance therefore the development is recommended for refusal.

Recommendation: Application Refused

Reason(s) for Refusal:

1 The proposed detached garage, by virtue of its size, bulk, and massing, would represent an unduly dominant and incongruous addition to the site and locality which would be out of character with the existing dwelling and the wider surrounding area. The proposed detached garage would appear as a dominant addition that would lack subservience to the main dwelling and would result in an intrusive and overbearing addition within this context. The development would therefore detract from the visual amenities of the locality, 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/25/0453
Schedule of plans/documents **not approved**:

Plan Type	Description	Drawing Number	Received Date
Elevation & Floor plan	Existing Floor Plans and Elevations	2015/1	24.03.2025
Block plan	Site Layout Plan	NONE	24.03.2025
Elevation & Floor plan	Proposed Two Storey Side Extension	2015/2 Rev A	24.03.2025
Location plan		NONE	24.03.2025

Elevation & Floor plan	Proposed Residential Garage and Storage Building with Room in Roof Space	2015/3	24.03.2025

DELEGATED

Case Officer sign/initial Halima Chowdhury Date: 15.05.2025

Authorising Officer sign/initial Tamara Dale Date: 19.05.2025