



# **PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT**

**TO:** Planning Committee  
**BY:** Head of Development  
**DATE:** 30 April 2019  
**DEVELOPMENT:** Erection of a single storey side extension  
**SITE:** 3 Chalice Walk High Street Rusper Horsham West Sussex RH12 4FA  
**WARD:** Rusper and Colgate  
**APPLICATION:** DC/18/1742  
**APPLICANT:** **Name:** Mr and Mrs Maynard **Address:** 3 Chalice Walk Rusper West Sussex RH12 4FA

**REASON FOR INCLUSION ON THE AGENDA:** To update Members following the resolution of the Committee at its meeting on 4 December 2018

**RECOMMENDATION:** To approve planning permission

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 At Planning Committee North on 4 December 2018 Members discussed the scale of the proposed extension and were concerned that it would have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring property through loss of light because of the height of the extension. The ridge height of the extension was also considered out of keeping with the existing development and likely to have a detrimental impact on the setting of the neighbouring Grade I Listed church. It was therefore resolved that the application be deferred to allow discussions with the Applicant in respect of a reduction in the height of the proposed extension.
- 1.2 Discussions have taken place with the agent and an amended plan has been received which have reduced the ridge height of the extension by approximately 1 metre; this has been achieved by reducing the front and rear roof pitch of the extension. These plans have been re-consulted upon, and an additional representation was received as set out below.
- 1.3 Rusper Parish Council strongly objects to this application for the following reasons:
  - This will impact the view from the neighbouring Grade I listed church.
  - This extends the current building line by 2m towards the church, which will imbalance the view of the houses and impact on the hedgerow.
  - This is a sensitive conservation area and the view of it from the churchyard will be impacted.
- 1.4 A further neighbour representation was received, objecting to the proposal for the following reasons:-

- The scale of drawing for the proposed plan is vague and does not indicate the actual dimensions for the height of the extension/roof height;
- The proposed plan is also inaccurate as the front elevation drawing shows no front living room window whereas the ground floor plan shows one (*N.B. This has since been corrected through the submission of a corrected floor plan*);
- The impact the proposed roof design and height in relation to overshadowing and loss of light;
- Impact of the roof height and design on outlook from the perspective of the listed church next door.

1.5 The impact of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the site and surroundings was considered in the preceding committee report. As part of this it was noted that:-

*“While the extension is larger than that that is currently to the side elevation of the property, it is considered to be of a scale that would not overly dominate or overwhelm the existing property or adversely affect its character and appearance. The plot is of a size that can comfortably take an extension of the size proposed without appearing as an overdevelopment of the plot and as such it is considered to represent a sympathetic and appropriate addition to the property.*

*Given its location within a small courtyard development, the proposal, which would not be seen from the wider public vantage points, is not considered to have an adverse impact on either the setting of the adjacent grade I listed church or the conservation area. The Council’s Conservation Officer has raised no objection to the application. The extension will be seen within the context of the main house and wider modern courtyard development and there is mature planting between the site and the adjoining churchyard. As such it is considered that there would be no adverse impact, as a result of the extension of the property, on setting of the adjacent listed building and the conservation area.”*

1.6 The reduction in height of the extension results in a lesser visual impact than that previously considered and as such the above considerations would apply equally to the amended scheme. In respect of the concern raised in relation to the submitted plans, these are sufficiently clear and drawn to a recognised scale so as to allow the scheme to be properly considered.

## **2. CONCLUSION**

2.1 It is considered, as set out in the previous committee report (attached below), that the proposed development would not harm the character of the existing dwelling or of the street scene, and would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, in compliance with policies 32, 33 and 34 of the HDPF.

2.2 It is therefore recommended that the application is approved subject to the conditions set out in section 7 of the original committee report, as set out below:-

### **1 A list of the approved plans**

**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 and finishes of all new external walls, windows and roofs of the development hereby permitted shall match in type, colour and texture those of the existing building.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Background Papers: DC/18/1742  
Case Officer: Pauline Ollive





**TO:** Planning Committee  
**BY:** Head of Development  
**DATE:** 4 December 2018  
**DEVELOPMENT:** Erection of a single storey side extension  
**SITE:** 3 Chalice Walk High Street Rusper Horsham West Sussex RH12 4FA  
**WARD:** Rusper and Colgate  
**APPLICATION:** DC/18/1742  
**APPLICANT:** **Name:** Mr and Mrs Maynard **Address:** 3 Chalice Walk Rusper West Sussex RH12 4FA

**REASON FOR INCLUSION ON THE AGENDA:** At the request of the Parish Council.

**RECOMMENDATION:** To approve planning permission subject to appropriate conditions.

**1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT**

1.1 To consider the planning application.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

1.2 The application seeks planning permission for a single storey side extension to the north side of the house following the demolition of the existing lean-to extension.

1.3 The proposed extension would project from the side of the dwelling by a further 3 metres when compared to the existing lean-to extension and would be set back by a minimal amount from both the front and rear elevations of the existing property.

1.4 The existing extension has a mono-pitch roof, with the extension proposed to have a gable end roof form, with an increased height to the ridge of some 1.2 metres. The proposal would increase the habitable living space of the dwelling at single storey level.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

1.5 The application property is one of a semi-detached pair that lies within a relatively new courtyard development of 3 bedroomed dwellings. Access to the courtyard is from the High Street via an undercroft. The application dwelling is a one and a half storey building with first floor accommodation built into the roof space. The property has dormer windows to the front and rear elevations and is constructed of stock brick, with weatherboarding to the first floor and elements of the existing extension, with a clay tiled roof.

- 1.6 The property is located within the built up area boundary of Rusper and within the Rusper Conservation Area. To the north of the site is St Mary Magdalene's Church, a grade 1 ecclesiastical listed building, which is screened by a mature vegetative boundary between the Church and the Chalice Walk. To the west of the property is the extended graveyard and to the east is 4 Chalice Walk. To the south of the property is the other half of the building (2 Chalice Walk) and to the southeast and east are the remaining properties within the Chalice Walk courtyard development.

## 2. INTRODUCTION

### STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

### RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES

- 2.2 The following Policies are considered to be relevant to the assessment of this application:

#### 2.3 **National Planning Policy Framework**

#### 2.4 **Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF 2015)**

Policy 32 - Strategic Policy: The Quality of New Development

Policy 33 - Development Principles

Policy 34 - Cultural and Heritage Assets

- 2.5 Supplementary Planning Guidance:  
N/A

### RELEVANT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

- 2.6 The Parish of Rusper was designated as a Neighbourhood Development Plan Area on 18 February 2016 however to date there is no 'made' neighbourhood plan for the Parish.

### PLANNING HISTORY AND RELEVANT APPLICATIONS

- 2.7 The most recent and relevant planning history relating to the site is as follows:

DC/13/0657	Demolition of existing garages and erection of 4 new houses with associated parking and amenity space (Full Planning)	Application on 17.06.2014	Permitted
------------	---	---------------------------	-----------

## 3. OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS

- 3.1 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](http://www.horsham.gov.uk)

### INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

- 3.2 **HDC Conservation:** No Objection.  
No additional harm would result on the Conservation Area or the setting of the listed Church due to the position of the extension in the context of the main house and the boundary treatment between the graveyard and the dwelling.

## PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

- 3.3 4 emails/letters of objection, from 1 household, have been received objecting to the application on the following grounds;
- Loss of light and overshadowing.
  - Loss of privacy.
  - Overly dominant.
  - Loss of view.

## PARISH COUNCIL

- 3.4 **Rusper Parish Council:** Object.
- Impact on neighbouring property
  - Impact on St Mary Magdalene's Church

## 4. HOW THE PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION WILL PROMOTE HUMAN RIGHTS

- 4.1 Article 8 (Right to respect of a Private and Family Life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (Protection of Property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to this application, Consideration of Human rights forms part of the planning assessment below.

## 5. HOW THE PROPOSAL WILL HELP TO REDUCE CRIME AND DISORDER

- 5.1 It is not considered that the development would be likely to have any significant impact on crime and disorder.

## 6. PLANNING ASSESSMENTS

- 6.1 The main issues are the principle of the development in the location and the effect of the development on:
- The character of the dwelling and the visual amenities of the area
  - The amenities of the occupiers of adjacent properties

### Impact on the character of the dwelling and the visual amenities of the area

- 6.2 Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) states, amongst other criteria, that extensions should have regard to their natural and built surroundings in terms of their design, scale and character. An extension should be of a scale which is sympathetic to and does not overpower the original building.
- 6.3 The application would involve the erection of a pitch roofed extension to the side of the house that is 3 metres wide and 7.9 metres deep and would replace an existing lean-to extension. The proposed extension would be set back by a minimal distance from both the front and rear elevations of the existing property and would be sited approximately 4 metres from the northern side boundary of the property which adjoins St Mary Magdalene's Church which is grade I listed.
- 6.4 Whilst the proposed extension is larger than that that is currently to the side elevation of the property, it is considered to be of a scale that would not overly dominate or overwhelm the existing property or adversely affect its character and appearance. The plot is of a size that can comfortably take an extension of the size proposed without appearing as an

overdevelopment of the plot and as such it is considered to represent a sympathetic and appropriate addition to the property.

- 6.5 Given its location within a small courtyard development, the proposal, which would not be seen from the wider public vantage points, is not considered to have an adverse impact on either the setting of the adjacent grade I listed church or the conservation area. The Council's Conservation Officer has raised no objection to the application. The extension will be seen within the context of the main house and wider modern courtyard development and there is mature planting between the site and the adjoining churchyard. As such it is considered that there would be no adverse impact, as a result of the extension of the property, on setting of the adjacent listed building and the conservation area.

#### Amenities of the occupiers of adjacent properties

- 6.6 Policy 33 relates to development principles and requires development, amongst other matters, to not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding occupiers through overlooking or noise.
- 6.7 The extension to the property will be constructed to the side elevation and therefore the neighbour most affected by the proposal will be 4 Chalice Walk. The application property and the adjoining neighbour are set at right angles to each other and there is a distance of some 8 metres between the properties. 4 Chalice Walk does not have any windows within its side elevations and is separated by a close boarded timber fence. The proposed extension will have no windows within its front elevation which faces towards 4 Chalice Walk.
- 6.8 Given the relationship of the properties it is not considered that the relationship as currently experienced by both properties would alter significantly and there would be no loss of privacy as a result of the proposal.
- 6.9 Whilst it is acknowledged that there would be a change in the relationship between the two properties in terms of the extent of development within the side garden area of 3 Chalice Walk, it is not considered that the extension as proposed will result in a loss of light or have an overbearing impact on the occupiers of the adjacent property.
- 6.10 It is therefore considered that the extension as proposed is acceptable in terms of its impact on neighbouring amenity and would not result in any significant or material adverse impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent property sufficient to warrant refusal of the application.

#### Conclusion

- 6.11 For the reasons outlined above, it is considered that the proposed single storey side extension would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the existing property or its setting within the wider streetscene, would not result in harm to the setting of the adjacent listed building or the conservation area and would not significantly affect the privacy or amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring property. The application is therefore considered to comply with the relevant policies as set out in the HDPF and is therefore recommended for approval.

## **7. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 7.1 It is recommended that the application is approved subject to appropriate conditions as set out below:

- 1 A list of the approved plans

- 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 and finishes of all new external walls, windows and roofs of the development hereby permitted shall match in type, colour and texture those of the existing building.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity and in accordance with Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

Background Papers: DC/18/1742