Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 November 2026

by J Davis, BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 November 2026

Appeal Ref: 6016060
Cibses Cottage, Kidders Lane, Henfield, West Sussex, BN5 9AB

- 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 Sean Bidwell against the decision of Horsham District Council.
- The application Ref is DC/26/0717.
- The development proposed is described as 'Householder planning permission for a proposed two storey rear extension'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised in August 2026. In this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal are unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and site.

Reasons

4. The appeal concerns a detached dwelling located in a large, well landscaped plot. The dwelling forms one of a cluster of buildings at the end of Kidders Lane, in a rural location in the open countryside. When observed from the front, its appearance is mostly of a well-proportioned, two-storey dwelling. However, the rear elevation is less well integrated and is dominated by a three-storey turret and two large gables with windows serving second-floor accommodation.

5. The proposed two storey extension would have a flat roof enclosed by railings to create a large roof terrace, accessed through new doors in the existing building.

6. The extension would span the full width of the existing main dwelling and would be of considerable depth. Although lower in height, it would substantially increase the dwelling's bulk and mass, failing to respect its existing scale and proportions. Consequently, the extension would visually overwhelm and dominate the host dwelling, significantly detracting from its character and appearance.

7. The detailed design of the extension would also be unsympathetic to the host building. Its higher eaves would prevent it from appearing well integrated with the existing dwelling. The large window openings would be overly dominant and would not respect the pattern and alignment of existing openings. The balcony railings would introduce an unduly urban feature, distinctly out of keeping with the countryside setting.

8. Overall, the extension would be a bulky, incongruous and visually intrusive addition, which would be disproportionate in relation to the size, scale and proportions of the host dwelling. It would harm the character and appearance of both the dwelling and the site.

9. I acknowledge that the development would not be readily visible from public vantage points, including the nearby footpath. However, the lack of public visibility does not justify unacceptable design. Furthermore, the absence of overlooking of other residential occupiers does not justify the proposal.

10. The appellant has highlighted the difficulties of designing a pitched roof extension due to the position of the upper floor windows. However, my concerns relate to a combination of factors rather than simply the flat roof form of the extension.

11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the site. It would be contrary to Policies 28, 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy 12 of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan (2021). Together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that development is of a high quality design which relates sympathetically to its surroundings and for extensions not to be disproportionate to the size of the existing dwelling and to be in keeping with its scale and character.

Conclusion

12. I have found that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole, and material considerations do not outweigh that finding. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR