



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2026 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by R Major BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th August 2026

Appeal Ref: 6008268

25 Depot Road, Horsham, West Sussex RH13 5HE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Mark Long against the decision of Horsham District Council.
- The application Ref is DC/26/0296.
- The development proposed is a rear first floor extension over existing ground floor zone, proposed rear loft dormer and loft conversion, front roof windows, new roof to existing porch and minor alterations.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of occupiers of 27 Depot Road (No 27), with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling situated on a corner plot in a residential area. There is some variety to the appearance of the dwellings on Depot Road, and some have extensions. Nevertheless, even accounting for the single storey rear extension at the appeal property, it still forms a balanced pair with the adjoining property at No 27 given their similar two-storey scale and hipped roof form. As such, the well-balanced appearance of this pair of dwellings contributes positively to the character and appearance of Depot Road, as well as when viewed from the side and rear along Stirling Way.
5. As a result of their combined scale and mass, the proposed first floor rear extension and dormer would collectively appear as bulky and excessive additions to the host dwelling. Furthermore, the considerable scale and flat roof design of the proposed dormer would form a jarring and dominant structure on the rear roof slope, creating a significant visual mass of built development at roof level.

6. Consequently, I find the proposed rear extensions would represent incongruous additions which would eradicate the simple appearance of the host dwelling's rear elevation and harmfully erode the balance of this pair of semi-detached properties, to the detriment of the appearance of the street scene. In addition, the proposed rear extensions would appear especially conspicuous given the site's corner plot location, and this would exacerbate the visual harm of the development.
7. The appellant refers to various extensions and loft conversions on Depot Road, with photographs of such examples provided. Although I observed some of these on my site visit, I do not have the full details or the planning background in order to make a full comparison with the appeal proposal. Furthermore, none of these examples appear to be the same in terms of the combination of various extensions to a single dwelling and even if these examples confirm the variety of the built form in the area, they do not justify the harm I have identified that the proposal would cause to the appearance of the appeal property and its immediate surroundings. As such, I attribute limited weight to these other extensions in my determination of this appeal.
8. In view of all the above, I conclude that the proposed rear extensions would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) (HDPF) and Policies HB3 and HB4 of the Horsham Blueprint Business Neighbourhood Plan (Made in 2022), where they together seek to ensure, amongst other things, that developments are of a high-quality design which is sympathetic to the local context and integrates well with the surroundings.
9. The proposal would also fail to satisfy the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character and where it states that development that is not well designed should be refused.

Living Conditions

10. The side boundary between the rear gardens of the appeal property and the adjoining dwelling at No 27 is formed of a fence which is of a moderate height. No 27 has both ground and first floor windows in its rear elevation which are set close to the shared side boundary between the properties. Although I do not have the full floorplans for the neighbouring property, I note the submitted plans suggest that the ground floor window serves a kitchen-utility zone and the first-floor window a bedroom.
11. The existing single storey rear extension at the host dwelling already likely impacts upon the outlook from the room which the nearest ground floor window at No 27 serves. Even so, given the depth and height of the proposed first floor rear extension, it would introduce additional built form along the side boundary in close proximity to this window. Consequently, the proposal would increase the sense of enclosure to the room which this ground floor window at No 27 serves. For the same reasons, the proposed first floor extension would also enclose the room served by the nearest first-floor window in the rear of No 27.
12. I therefore find that the proposal would have a significantly overbearing impact, increase the sense of enclosure and have a detrimental impact upon the outlook from these windows for occupiers of this adjoining property. In coming to this view, I acknowledge that the extension would be set in slightly from the side boundary,

however this would not be sufficient to offset the harm as it would still be very close to both these windows in the rear elevation of No 27.

13. The additional built form to the rear elevation of the host dwelling would also further enclose the immediate rear garden area of No 27, resulting in some loss of outlook. Despite this, the majority of the neighbour's garden would remain unaffected by the proposal. Therefore, I find that the proposal would not have an unduly overbearing impact on the outlook from the rear garden area of No 27, albeit this does not justify the loss of outlook which would be experienced by occupiers of this adjoining property from the rooms served by the nearest windows in the rear elevation.
14. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed first floor extension would be unacceptably harmful to the living conditions of occupiers of No 27, in terms of loss of outlook from the nearest windows in both the ground and first floors of the rear elevation. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy 33 of the HDPF, where it requires, amongst other matters, that developments avoid unacceptable harm to the amenity of occupiers of nearby properties. It would also be contrary to paragraph 135(f) of the Framework which seeks to ensure developments provide a high standard of amenity for existing users.

Other Matters

15. Although I sympathise with the appellant in terms of their desire to meet the needs of their growing household, this does not justify the overall harm of the proposal. In addition, whilst the Framework supports sustainable development and the effective use of land, it also seeks to ensure that developments add to the overall quality of the area and provide a high standard of amenity for existing users. For the reasons I have already explained, the proposal would fail to meet these objectives.
16. The appellant's concerns regarding the Council's behaviour in terms of its lack of engagement and the lack of opportunity to amend the scheme are noted. However, whilst frustrating for the appellant, this is not a reason to allow the appeal. Furthermore, the absence of objections from neighbours and the Parish Council does not alter my conclusions on the appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. The proposed development would be contrary to the development plan overall and there are no other material considerations which would outweigh this conflict. Consequently, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

R Major

INSPECTOR