Nimble
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Friday, 11 April 2025

Objection to Application DC/25/0433

Site Address: 50 Kempshott Road, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 2EY

Description: Demolition of existing conservatory. Erection of a single storey side and rear extension.

Introduction:

This objection letter relates to application DC/25/0433, which is a householder planning application for the demolition of the existing conservatory and the erection of a single storey side and rear extension at 50 Kempshott Road, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 2EY.

This objection has been submitted on behalf [redacted] of 48 Kempshott Road.

Discussion of Scheme:

Design and Visual Amenity:

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets a clear expectation that planning decisions must ensure developments contribute positively to the overall quality of the area for the duration of their lifetime. This includes being visually attractive through good architecture, appropriate layout, and effective landscaping; being sympathetic to local character and context; and establishing a strong sense of place through considered design of streets, spaces, building forms, and materials. Moreover, Paragraph 139 of the NPPF is unequivocal in stating that development which is not well designed should be refused.

The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) reinforces this principle, stating that good design is not only about visual appeal, but about creating places that function well for all users and evolve to meet future needs. At a local level, Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) promote high-quality, contextually responsive design that respects the character, scale, and massing of its surroundings.

While there is no objection in principle to the extension of the existing dwelling to provide enhanced living accommodation, such proposals must respond sensitively to the constraints of the site and its wider context.

The proposed rear extension constitutes an excessively large and unbalanced addition. At 9 metres in depth and nearly matching the full width of the host building, its footprint is comparable to that of the original dwelling—rendering it far from modest or subservient. Its sheer scale would overwhelm the host property and visually dominate the rear garden, resulting in an appearance of overdevelopment that fails to respect the established spacious grain of the surrounding area.

From the rear elevation and neighbouring viewpoints, the extension would appear bulky, intrusive, and disproportionate. Rather than integrating seamlessly with the host dwelling, it would read as an awkward and unsympathetic addition, jarring with the form and proportions of the existing building.

The resulting visual impact is both overbearing and incongruous, undermining the character and quality of the site and its setting.

In conclusion, the proposed extension represents a poor standard of design that conflicts with national and local planning policy objectives. It fails to deliver the high-quality, context-sensitive development required by Paragraphs 135 and 139 of the NPPF, the guidance set out in the PPG, and the design principles enshrined in Policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF and Policy 3 of the Steyning Neighbourhood Plan. The proposal should therefore be firmly refused.

Residential Amenity:

Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) outlines six core principles for achieving well-designed places, including criterion (f), which explicitly requires development to "create places... with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users." Complementing this, the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) reinforces that good design is not merely aesthetic but must function effectively for all users and be adaptable to future needs.

Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) further obliges development proposals to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring properties, particularly with respect to avoiding harmful impacts from noise, loss of privacy, and overshadowing. These national and local policies establish a clear and consistent requirement for protecting residential amenity.

In this context, the proposed rear extension fails to comply with both national and local policy objectives. It would be constructed immediately along the shared eastern boundary with 48 Kempshott Road, projecting 2.34 metres beyond that property's rear elevation within close proximity to rear-facing habitable room windows. Furthermore, there are side-facing glazing features which serve habitable rooms at No. 52 which face directly towards the application site from the outrigger element; the extension would sit directly across from these windows. The scale and positioning of the extension would result in a marked and demonstrable loss of outlook and light to these rooms, creating an oppressive and claustrophobic environment that falls well below acceptable standards of amenity.

Moreover, the extension's proximity to the amenity areas of both No. 48 and No. 52—combined with its 3.3-metre apex height and considerable rearward projection—would lead to a substantial sense of enclosure and an overbearing presence. This would unreasonably diminish the openness currently enjoyed by neighbouring occupiers and lead to significant overshadowing of key garden areas, including patios which are likely to be the most actively used sections of outdoor amenity space.

In conclusion, the proposed development represents an oversized and insensitively sited form of extension that would cause demonstrable and unacceptable harm to the amenity of adjoining residents. It fails to meet the standards required by the NPPF, the PPG, and Policy 33 of the HDPF, and should therefore be refused on these grounds.

Conclusion

Taking both design quality and residential amenity into account, it is clear that the proposed rear extension fails to meet the requirements of national and local planning policy. The development constitutes an overly large, poorly proportioned, and visually intrusive addition that does not respect the form or character of the host dwelling or its context. It would result in a cramped and overdeveloped appearance, significantly out of keeping with the surrounding built environment, contrary to Paragraphs 135 and 139 of the NPPF and Policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF.

Furthermore, the extension would result in demonstrable and unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, through loss of outlook, light, and privacy, and by introducing an overbearing sense of enclosure. These impacts represent a clear conflict with the amenity requirements of the NPPF and Policy 33 of the HDPF.

The proposal therefore constitutes a form of development that is neither well-designed nor appropriate for its context. In failing to safeguard both visual quality and residential amenity, the application conflicts with multiple strands of the development plan and national guidance. It is recommended that planning permission be refused in full on these grounds.