



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2026

by Stewart Glassar BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th September 2026

Appeal Ref: 6013133

1 Bailey Close, Horsham, RH12 5QR

- 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 Joseph Torgbor against the decision of Horsham District Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/26/0376.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey front extension, a two-storey rear and side extension with a single storey infill rear 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.

Preliminary Matter

3. I have taken the description of development from the Council's decision notice as it more accurately reflects that for which permission is sought.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached house on the corner of Bailey Close and Meadow Farm Lane. Houses in the immediate vicinity display a similar design aesthetic and range of external finishes to that of the appeal property. Some of these neighbouring dwellings have been altered or extended but their overall size and appearance fits within the prevailing character of the area, which is one of modest buildings and a broad sense of homogeneity.
5. The proposal comprises several elements and when taken as a whole, the extensions would notably increase the size and bulk of the building. Accordingly, the results would appear very obvious in the street scene, bringing the building noticeably closer to the side boundary of the site. There would also be a number of competing roof forms, extensions and heights across the building which, given its prominent corner position, would be clearly visible and which cumulatively would create a somewhat incongruous and over-extended appearance. The use of matching materials would not overcome this harm.
6. As such, the extensions overall would not appear subservient but instead would appear out of proportion to the scale of the existing dwelling and other buildings in the vicinity. The proposal would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and thus it would conflict with Policies 32 and 33 of the

Horsham District Planning Framework 2015 which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to, and integrates with, its surroundings.

Other Matters

7. The Council comments that in isolation some elements of the scheme would appear modest, and I note that a single storey front extension was previously permitted by the Council. However, I must consider the scheme which has been presented to me as a whole and thus the previous permission for part of the current proposal, regardless of whether or not it is extant, is not of sufficient weight to lead me to allow the appeal.
8. Harm to living conditions was not identified as a reason for refusal and there was no objection to the proposal from residents of the adjoining property. A lack of harm to neighbours would be expected for any development to be considered acceptable and so this does not weigh in favour of this particular proposal. Similarly, the absence of other harms, such as to highway safety, does not absolve me from making a decision in relation to the main issue of the case.
9. Reference has been made to other two-storey side extensions approved by the Council, but I was not provided with their addresses, only planning application numbers. I therefore am unable to make direct comparisons. However, I did observe other extensions to houses in the vicinity of the appeal site. These generally appear to assimilate acceptably in terms of their design and do not, based on what I have seen, harm the character and appearance of the street scene in the same way the appeal proposals would.
10. An existing boundary hedge screens part of the site. Notwithstanding the fact that a hedge can be easily removed, provide less protection at various times of the year or simply suffer disease and die, it would not provide the level of protection necessary to overcome the harms I have identified above.
11. I understand that the proposal would meet the needs of the existing occupiers but Planning Practice Guidance advises that planning permission usually runs with the land, and it is rarely appropriate to provide otherwise. There may be exceptional occasions where development that would not normally be permitted may be justified on planning grounds because of who would benefit from the permission but there are not sufficient grounds in this case to justify such an approach.
12. It was suggested that the decision notice did not contain the Council's reason for refusal. However, as part of this appeal I have been provided with a copy of the decision notice in which the reason for refusal is clearly set out. It is also evident that the appellant has responded to the main issues in this case, so it is not a matter on which I need to comment further.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Stewart Glassar

INSPECTOR