



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2025

**by Stewart Glassar BSc (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4<sup>th</sup> June 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y9507/D/24/3356464**

**Little Holt, Square Drive, Kingsley Green, Fernhurst, West Sussex GU27 3LW**

- 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 Jon Cummings against the decision of South Downs National Park Authority.
  - The application Ref is SDNP/24/03536/HOUS.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey side and front extension following the demolition of the existing garage.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two-storey side and front extension following the demolition of the existing garage at Little Holt, Square Drive, Kingsley Green, Fernhurst, West Sussex GU27 3LW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref SDNP/24/03536/HOUS, subject to the conditions in the schedule below.

### Preliminary Matter

2. At the time of my site visit some works had been undertaken to the side of the house. For the avoidance of doubt, this has no bearing on my decision, which is based on the plans before me, being those that the Council determined the application on.
3. There were some slight differences between what is shown on the submitted drawings and how the existing building appears. These anomalies mainly relate to the windows on the front elevation but also include the position of the chimneys and roof overhangs. However, I am satisfied that I had sufficient information to determine the appeal based on the evidence provided and my own observations on site.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the building.

### Reasons

5. The existing property is a sizable two-storey dwelling that sits within a large plot. With its projecting front gable, brick finish, clay tiled roof, dark framed windows, roof overhangs and chimneys, the main building offers a pleasant, well-proportioned Arts and Crafts type styling.

6. The proposed extension seeks to replicate the styling of the main dwelling. It would be largely on the same footprint as the existing single storey side extension/garage. As such, the additional bulk would be evident at first floor and roof level. However, to try to compensate for this the ridge height of the extension would be set down from that of the main roof. The set down is not large but would create a clear visual and physical break between the existing dwelling and the extension.
7. Similarly, the proposed layout would give the front façade a stepped appearance, which would help to break up the overall length and bulk of the resulting building. In particular, the extension's main elevation would be set back from that of the existing dwelling. Furthermore, a new gable would provide some visual relief and provide a noticeable break between the existing and new parts of the building. It would not however be set as far forward as the existing gable and so would not compete visually with it. The introduction of a dormer window on the front roof would also further assist in breaking up the long expanse of roof without distracting from the overall character and appearance of the dwelling.
8. To the rear, the scale of the extension would be more evident, with fewer design features employed to break up the additional bulk of the building. However, the distance to the main road and intervening boundary planting would ensure that views of this elevation would remain private.
9. Overall, the proposal would not be read as a particularly subservient addition to the existing house. A different eaves level between the existing and proposed parts of the building might have assisted in this regard. However, in my opinion given the site's context and the very limited views of the appeal site from Square Deal, this is something which would be desirable but not essential and so not a reason in itself to reject the proposal.
10. The existing character and appearance of the front elevation would be retained given the various design features employed within the extension. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposed development would not appear overly dominant, incongruous or visually prominent. As such, neither the character and appearance of the existing dwelling nor the landscape would be harmed.
11. The development plan seeks to limit increases in floorspace to approximately 30%. There is no information or evidence from the Council to indicate the proposal would breach this requirement.
12. Accordingly, I find that the proposal therefore accords with policies SD1, SD4, SD5 and SD31 of the South Downs Local Plan 2014-2033 which, collectively and amongst other things, seek to ensure development is of a sensitive and of a high quality of design which reflects the context and character of its location, thereby supporting the purposes of the National Park.

### **Conditions**

13. I make no determination as to whether works of development which have taken place accord with the submitted plans. Therefore, the standard time limit condition is necessary and, in the interests of certainty, a condition setting out the approved plans is also needed.

14. A condition requiring the external materials to reflect those of the main dwelling is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the building. It is also reasonable for a condition requiring the mitigation measures set out in the Bat Mitigation Plan (Aug 2024) to be implemented.

### **Conclusion**

15. For the reasons set out above, having considered the development plan as a whole and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Stewart Glassar*

INSPECTOR

### **Schedule of Conditions:**

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers:

|                                     |   |               |
|-------------------------------------|---|---------------|
| Location Plan                       | - | PP-13344833V1 |
| Block Plan                          | - | DWG-07        |
| Proposed East Elevation             | - | DWG-08        |
| Proposed First Floor Plan           | - | DWG-09        |
| Proposed Ground Floor Plan          | - | DWG-10        |
| Proposed Roof Plan                  | - | DWG-11        |
| Proposed Second Floor Plan          | - | DWG-12        |
| Proposed South and North Elevations | - | DWG-13        |
| Proposed West Elevation             | - | DWG-14        |
| Block Plan                          | - | DWG-15        |
- 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.
- 4) The mitigation measures set out in the Bat Mitigation Plan (August 2024) shall be fully implemented and thereafter maintained.

**\*\*\*End\*\*\***