Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2025

by E Everitt BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/D/25/3369660
Rosslyn, 5 Trundle Mead, Horsham, West Sussex RH12 2LY

- 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 & Mrs Paul Jones against the decision of Horsham District Council.
- The application Ref is DC25/0394.
- The development proposed is described on the application form as "proposed conversion of existing bungalow into a house with a single storey rear extension and a single storey side garage extension".

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a bungalow located to the south of Trundle Mead. This part of Trundle Mead predominantly consists of bungalows, some of which have been extended within their roofspaces and incorporate dormer windows. There are a small number of 2 storey dwellings at the north of the road where it joins Kingfisher Way. To the west along Old Millmeads 2 storey dwellings are also present. However, the immediate surroundings of the appeal site are characterised by relatively modest bungalows.

4. The proposal to extend the appeal property through conversion into a 2 storey house, the erection of a porch and the erection of side and rear extensions would result in a substantial increase in size. It would create a dwelling considerably larger than the existing property and the relatively modest bungalows in the immediate surroundings. It would, therefore, appear unduly prominent and represent an incongruous addition to the area, at odds with the prevailing pattern of development.

5. The appellant has brought to my attention the recent development at 11 Cottingham Avenue as an example of development similar in size to the proposal and set in a similar street scene. Although I have only limited information before me in respect of that case, or the planning balance undertaken there, the two schemes are, fundamentally, situated on different sites in different street scenes. Therefore, they are not directly comparable. In any event, each proposal should be considered on the basis of its own individual circumstances.

6. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, the appeal proposal is contrary to the relevant provisions of Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policies HB3 and HB4 of Horsham Blueprint Business Neighbourhood Plan 2019-2036. These policies, in summary, seek development which complements locally distinctive character, responds and integrates well with its surroundings and has a scale, massing and appearance which relates sympathetically with surrounding buildings.

Other Matters

7. I acknowledge the appellant wishes to enhance the sustainability of the dwelling including through design features which reduce energy usage and the installation of an air source heat pump and photovoltaic panels. The appellant has also proposed to source local materials and employ local businesses in construction, thereby supporting the local economy. However, from the evidence before me, there is no indication that similar benefits could not be achieved through an alternative development which better reflects and responds to the character and appearance of the area. The economic benefits, although positive, would inevitably be limited, due to the nature and scale of the scheme, and short term. Ultimately, this matter has not led me to an alternative conclusion on the main issue.

8. I am aware of one letter of support for the proposal for a neighbour. This letter comments on how the proposal would improve the appearance of the appeal property and the existing street scene. I acknowledge the support for the proposal; however, it does not lead me to an alternative conclusion on the main issue.

9. I appreciate the frustration of the appellant in communicating with the Council. Nonetheless, I have reviewed the information before me and have assessed the appeal on that basis. This matter would be best dealt with via an application for costs and does not lead me to an alternative conclusion on the main issue.

10. I also appreciate the frustrations of the appellant regarding the lack of self-build plots available as an alternative to the renovation of an existing property. However, this matter does not lead me to an alternative conclusion on the main issue.

11. I acknowledge that the proposal has been designed by the appellant to enable adaptation to suit future needs and support intergenerational living. I appreciate that in dismissing the appeal individuals would be unable to derive the benefits of being located closer to family, having the potential to disproportionally affect them. Nevertheless, and mindful of the Public Sector Equality Duty contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal before me is the only way in which this could be achieved. In this context, I do not consider that these personal circumstances provide sufficient justification to outweigh the harm I have identified from the proposal.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Everitt

INSPECTOR