
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2025

by R Dickson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y9507/D/25/3365065

Rindles, Selham Road, Selham, Lodsworth, West Sussex GU28 0PJ

- 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 Alex Jordan against the decision of South Downs National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref is SDNP/25/00392/HOUS.
 - The development proposed is for rear extensions and roof alterations with front and rear dormers. Raised ridge to garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Authority highlighted that the existing plan (ref 2024/50) submitted as part of the planning application did not accurately reflect the existing site owing to the omission of a conservatory to the rear. However, I found that there was no conservatory during my site visit. I am therefore satisfied that the plan accurately represents the existing property.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are (a) whether the increase in the size of the dwelling would be acceptable with specific regard to maintaining a mix of house sizes within the South Downs National Park (SDNP); and (b) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Maintaining a mix of house sizes

4. The appeal site is a bungalow within a row of 2 storey dwellings which address Selham Road. Despite being previously extended, the appeal property has retained its modest size across a single storey. The proposal would remove an existing small extension and replace it with a full width rear extension. One of the existing bedrooms on the ground floor would remain, while the addition of dormer windows would allow three bedrooms to be accommodated within the roof space.
5. Point 1 a) of Policy SD31 of the South Downs Local Plan 2014-2033 (2019) (Local Plan) seeks to permit extensions where the proposal does not increase the floorspace of the existing dwelling by more than approximately 30% unless there are exceptional circumstances. I have not been provided with exact figures of the increase in floorspace as a result of the proposal. However, it is evident from the plans before me that the rear extension and roof alterations would result in an

increase of floorspace of more than 30%. This fact has not been disputed by the appellant.

6. The appellant contends that the value of the appeal dwelling is such that it does not represent an affordable property or a starter home within the SDNP. I have not been provided with any evidence to support the valuation, nor have I been provided with any comparative figures of other dwellings within the SDNP. I therefore cannot be certain of the value of the dwelling, and as such, the valuation provided carries little weight. In any case, regardless of its value, the existing 2-bedroom dwelling makes a contribution to the existing supply of small and medium sized homes, which is outlined in Policy SD27 and is the purpose of Policy SD31, as identified in the policy supporting text.
7. I acknowledge that the appellant has renovated the dwelling and that the proposal would be for the growing family with local connections. However, these matters do not constitute exceptional circumstances. Accordingly, the increase in floorspace would exceed the 30% limit, and no exceptional circumstances have been put before me which would outweigh the loss of a small or medium sized home. As such, the proposal would not maintain a mix of house sizes within the SDNP, and would therefore fail to accord with point 1 a) of Policy SD31 of the Local Plan, which seeks to maintain the existing supply of small and medium sized homes.

Character and appearance

8. Adjacent to one side of the appeal site, the dwellings share consistent design characteristics, with a gable to the front elevation and a predominantly rendered façade finished in a light colour. To the other side, semi-detached dwellings and a detached dwelling have hipped roofs with brick and hung tile façades respectively. Rindles is unique within the row. It has painted brick on the front elevation, and being a bungalow, it is comparatively shorter than its neighbours. It shares elements of design details with its neighbours including its gables to the front, and hipped roof. Overall, Rindles makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
9. As part of the proposal, the dwelling would be clad in horizontal weatherboarding. While this would match the existing weatherboarding to the rear elevation and outbuilding, it is not currently seen within any public views. As such, the proposal would result in the introduction of the weatherboarding to the front and side elevations, and therefore into the street scene.
10. The proposed cladding would be broadly similar in colour to the existing painted brickwork and would therefore assimilate into the street scene and accord with paragraph C.5.3.11 of the South Downs National Park Adopted Design Guide 2022. Although the cladding would be a departure from the traditional materials used in the neighbouring dwellings, it would emphasise the horizontality and distinctiveness of the dwelling in a positive way.
11. Accordingly, the proposal would be in accordance with Policies SD1, SD4, SD5 and point 1 b) of Policy SD31 of the Local Plan. Collectively, they seek to ensure development is of a sensitive and high quality design which reflects the context and character of its location, thereby supporting the purposes of the National Park.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

12. I acknowledge that Lodsworth Parish Council raised no objection to the proposal, which together with my conclusion on character and appearance, weigh neutrally. However, through the increase in size, the proposal would reduce the supply of small and medium sized homes, a stated intent of Policy SD31. As such, the proposal conflicts with the development plan when taken as a whole.
13. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

R Dickson

INSPECTOR