

APPEAL STATEMENT

M: [REDACTED]
E: [REDACTED]
A: 25 Depot Rd, Horsham
RH13 5HE, West Sussex

Issue Date: 16-04-26

Project Address: 25 Depot Road, Horsham, West Sussex, RH13 5HE

Dear Sir/Madam,

We write to appeal the decision of Horsham District Council, who have refused our planning permission for a proposed householder home extension application. The proposal submitted, which has been refused, was a small first floor rear extension over part of an existing ground floor zone, with a hip to gable loft conversion and proposed rear loft dormer. A very common style and type of proposal seen on many properties in this area of Horsham and beyond that have previously gained planning consent for.

The proposal had been carefully considered and delivered with due regard to the character of the existing dwelling, the surrounding area, and the amenity of neighbouring properties. We respectfully disagree with the reasons for refusal and respond to each in turn below.

Reason 1 give for Refusal.

Alleged harm to character and appearance

The rear extensions by reason of their scale, form and design would represent discordant, unduly dominant and incongruous additions which would be inappropriate to the character and appearance of the host building, and which would harm the character or appearance of the wider area. The visual impact of the proposal is not acceptable and would be contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policies HB3 and HB4 of the Horsham Blueprint Business Neighbourhood Plan.

Our Response:

With respect, this conclusion does not reflect the prevailing character of the immediate area. The proposal has been designed to remain subservient to the existing dwelling, with proportions, materials and detailing that respond appropriately to the existing building. The extension would be read as a coherent and sympathetic addition, rather than an incongruous or dominant feature. The built form is staggered, softened and with close consideration to the neighbour's privacy, view and amenity.

Furthermore, the surrounding area—particularly along Depot Road and nearby streets—demonstrates a well-established pattern of similar domestic extensions and roof alterations. Many of these are of comparable or greater scale than the proposal submitted and in turn unjustly refused.

This context is clearly evidenced within the photographic report submitted with the application, showing various extensions approved and built in close proximity to the subject site, also now attached to accompany this appeal statement.

In this regard, the proposal reflects the established pattern of development and would sit comfortably within the street scene. It would not appear out of keeping, nor would it result in any material harm to the character or appearance of the area and negatively impact the neighbouring properties.

The proposal therefore accords with the design objectives of the development plan, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework, which supports well-designed development that is sympathetic to local character while allowing for appropriate and sustainable growth.

Reason 2 give for Refusal.

Alleged overbearing impact and loss of outlook.

The Council considers that the first-floor rear extension, by reason of its height and siting in proximity to the shared eastern boundary, would appear overbearing and result in a loss of outlook and increased sense of enclosure to the neighbouring property, contrary to Policy 33.

Our Response:

The proposal has been carefully designed to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

APPEAL STATEMENT

The extension is not positioned directly on the boundary and retains a degree of separation that assists in mitigating its visual impact. Its scale and siting have been considered in the context of the neighbouring property, ensuring that it would not give rise to an undue sense of enclosure.

When assessed in the round, including the depth of the adjoining garden, the spatial relationship between properties, and the existing pattern of built form, the proposal would not result in a materially harmful loss of outlook. Nor would it appear overbearing when viewed from neighbouring habitable rooms or private amenity space.

There would also be no unacceptable loss of light or overshadowing arising from the proposal submitted.

It is further noted that no objections were received from neighbouring occupiers and supported by the local Parish with no object or comments raised against the proposal, which is a material consideration and indicative of the limited impact of the proposal submitted.

Accordingly, the development would not result in unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity and is considered to comply with Policy 33.

Additional Considerations

The proposal represents a modest and proportionate extension to an existing dwelling, providing much needed additional bedrooms, currently a 2-bedroom home, to meet the reasonable needs of a growing household.

This is consistent with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework in supporting sustainable development and the effective use of residential land.

I would also respectfully note that officer's engagement wasn't present, rather a last-minute attempt to engage at week 7, after remaining silent, even when I met the Officer at the property to provide access around week 3 of the application, no comments were raised.

The only engagement on the proposal was in an email on Week 7, raising unjust reasons why she had already passed this to senior management with the recommendations for refusal, without consulting me previously as the applicant, to give a reasonable amount of time and opportunity to discuss, reason and refine the design, if deemed required to gain support.

A more proactive and fair approach from the Planning Officer, in a timelier manner, may have avoided the need for this appeal.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the proposal is proportionate, well-designed, and in keeping with both the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. It would not give rise to harm in respect of visual amenity or neighbouring living conditions and not have a negative impact on the character of this street and area.

I feel the proposal accords with the relevant policies of the development plan and with the National Planning Policy Framework.

I therefore respectfully request that the appeal be allowed and you hopefully see these points are just reason to grant planning permission for the proposal, to reverse the refusing received from HCD.

Thank you for your time and consideration.



Mark Long
Design and Sustainability Director

PHOTO REPORT- EXISTING CONDITION PHOTOS

Existing Property: Double Storey Residential Dwelling with Single Storey Side and Rear zone, Semi Detached.

Property Address: 25 Depot Road, Horsham RH13 5HE, West Sussex.



Front of Subject Site- No. 25 - Above



Front-side of Subject Site- No. 25 - Above



Side of Subject Site- No. 25 - Above



Rear of Subject Site- No. 25- Above



Rear of Subject Site- No. 25- Above



Rear Of Subject Site- No. 25- Above



Rear of Neighbouring Properties of Subject Site- No. 25- Above



Neighbouring Properties of Subject Site- No. 25- Above

Neighbouring Properties in Depot Road, include Extensions and Loft Conversions- Below





