Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2025

by J Pearce MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/D/25/3368187
5 De Braose Way, Bramber, West Sussex BN44 3FD

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
- The appeal is made by Andy & Luci Warwick against the decision of Horsham District Council.
- The application Ref is DC/25/0306.
- The development proposed is an additional storey.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the application form. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the description given on the original application form. I do not consider that this has prejudiced any of the parties and I have proceeded with the appeal on this basis.

3. The proposed plans include a single-storey extension to rear of the dwelling. Planning permission was granted under reference DC/24/1344 for development, including a single-storey extension and a loft conversion with dormers. An extension is under construction to the rear of the dwelling. Nonetheless, for the avoidance of doubt, the single-storey extension does not form part of the appeal proposal before me.

Background and Main Issue

4. Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the Town and County Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO), permits development comprising the enlargement of a dwellinghouse consisting of the construction of (a) up to two additional storeys, where the existing dwellinghouse consists of two or more storeys; or (b) one additional storey, where the existing dwellinghouse consists of one storey, immediately above the topmost storey of the dwellinghouse, together with any engineering operations reasonably necessary for the purpose of that construction.

5. The Council concluded that the proposal would comply with the conditions and limitations set out at paragraph AA.1 of Class AA, such that it would fall within the scope of permitted development rights, subject to consideration of relevant matters

of prior approval. On the evidence before me I see no reason to take a different view.

6. The conditions of paragraph AA.2 (3)(a)(ii) require consideration of the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, including the principal elevation and any side elevation that fronts a highway.

7. The main issue is whether prior approval should be granted under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class AA of the GPDO, having particular regard to the effect of the proposed development on the external appearance of the dwellinghouse.

Reasons

8. The appeal site comprises a detached dwelling within a row of predominantly single-storey dwellings fronting De Braose Way. The dwellings are typically finished with a combination of hanging tiles and brick, beneath dual-pitched roofs and, given their similar scale, form a cohesive group of buildings. The visual continuity from a gentle rise in ridge heights reflects the gradient of the land, particularly as development extends away from Castle Lane. The gradual rise contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. There are two-storey dwellings within De Braose Way, including at Orchard House, but such development is primarily set back from the road.

9. The external appearance of the existing dwelling at the site is defined in part by its forward-facing gable and simple palette of materials. The modest scale and mass of the building relate well with those of the neighbouring dwellings on either side of the site. The existing dwelling occupies a discreet position within the row of development, particularly given its position towards the lower end of De Braose Way.

10. Paragraph AA.2 (3)(a)(ii) of Class AA requires prior approval to be sought for 'the external appearance of the dwellinghouse, including the design and architectural features of (aa) the principal elevation of the dwellinghouse, and (bb) any side elevation of the dwellinghouse that fronts a highway.' The use of the word 'including' means that the lists that follow are not exhaustive and that other factors could affect the external appearance of the dwellinghouse.

11. The proposal would extend the existing dwelling upwards through the provision of an additional storey. The elevations of the additional storey, including the principal elevation, would reflect the layout of windows in the existing dwelling and would incorporate matching external materials. Nevertheless, the increase in height would interrupt the rhythm of ridge heights that primarily follow the gradient of the rising land. The considerable height of the dwelling resulting from the additional storey would appear incongruous within the row of predominantly single-storey dwellings and would disrupt the established visual continuity. Moreover, the substantial mass at first floor level would starkly jar with the diminutive scale of the neighbouring properties.

12. I conclude that the external appearance of the extended dwellinghouse would be harmful. The proposal would therefore not accord with the requirements of paragraph AA.2 (3)(a) (ii) of Class AA of the GPDO and would be contrary to Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires development to, amongst others, be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

13. The development approved under planning permission reference DC/24/1344 included two dormers within the roof slopes of the existing dwelling and comprises a fallback position. Nonetheless, the proposal before me is for an additional storey under the prior approval procedure and I have considered the appeal on the basis requirements within the GPDO.

14. The appellant has referred to the enlargement of dwellings through an additional storey in Roman Road and at Castle Cottage. However, I have not been provided with the precise details of these developments and am unable to draw sufficient comparisons with the appeal scheme before me. In any event, each proposal should be considered on its individual merits and I cannot be certain that the circumstances of development at Roman Road and Castle Cottage are similar to those before me.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

J Pearce

INSPECTOR