Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2025

by B Pattison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th of September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/D/25/3367372
The Old Paddock, Leechpond Hill, Lower Beeding, West Sussex RH13 6NR

- 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 Nick White against the decision of Horsham District Council.
- The application Ref is DC/25/0453.
- The development proposed is described as Proposed two storey side extension, demolition of existing redundant stables and construction of detached garage and storage building with room in the roof space.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission granted for proposed two storey side extension, demolition of existing redundant stables and construction of detached garage and storage building with room in the roof space at The Old Paddock, Leechpond Hill, Lower Beeding, West Sussex RH13 6NR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: DC/25/0453 dated 21 March 2025, subject to the following conditions:

    1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

    2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan; DENRA/2015/1; DENRA/2015/2/A; DENR/2015/3; Site Layout Plan.

    3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development shall be those specified in the application form.

    4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) the detached garage and storage building with room in the roof space, hereby permitted shall be used only for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling, The Old Paddock, Leechpond Hill, Lower Beeding (as identified on the approved plans) and shall not be used for any trade or business nor as a separate living accommodation.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site contains a two storey semi-detached property and a single storey building described as a redundant stables. The property is located on a private road accessed via a gated entrance.

4. The appeal dwelling and stables are situated on land that lies slightly below the level of Leechpond Hill. Due to their recessed position, set well back from the public highway and screened by a gated entrance, boundary wall, and surrounding vegetation, the appeal property is not particularly prominent in public views from the highway.

5. The proposed garage would be located in the same position as the stables which it would replace. Whilst it would have a large footprint, this would not be significantly larger than the stables which would be replaced, and unlike the stables it would have an L-shaped footprint which would mediate its mass. It would not project significantly beyond the front of the host dwelling. I accept that the garage would be clearly visible in views from the private road. The siting of the garage close to existing buildings would mean that any views of the garage from the private road would be in the context of existing built development, rather than appearing as a visually isolated building.

6. In terms of its height, the appellant indicates that the garage would be lower than the height of the host dwelling, and the adjoining semi-detached property. The garage's half hip roof design with low eaves lines would also reduce its visual bulk. Whilst it would be a large building, because of its position and the height of surrounding properties, it would not be incongruous or have a harmful effect on the prevailing character of the area.

7. The garage would infill the gap between the host dwelling and the site boundary. However, this would not differ from the current layout of the stables. Therefore, given that I have found the scale of the garage to be appropriate to the existing built character, it would not result in an overdevelopment of the plot, nor erode the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

8. For the above reasons, the development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal therefore complies with Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015). Together, amongst other things, these require that development is compatible with surrounding buildings and protects the character of the countryside.

Conditions

9. In imposing the conditions, I have had regard to the tests for planning conditions in paragraph 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) and the Planning Practice Guidance. In this respect there is a need for the standard implementation condition and a condition listing the plans to which the proposal should accord. To ensure the satisfactory appearance and form of development, a condition controlling the materials is necessary. In the interests of ensuring the development is water neutral, I have imposed a condition which restricts the use of the building to purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling.

Other Matters

10. The Council's officer report sets out that the two storey extension is considered acceptable. Based on the submitted evidence and following an assessment of the proposal during my site visit, I find no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusion that the two storey extension is acceptable.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the proposed development would accord with the development plan. The appeal is therefore allowed.

B Pattison

INSPECTOR