



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2025

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/D/25/3373104

Hurley Farm, Turners Hill Road, East Grinstead, WEST SUSSEX RH19 4LB

- 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 & Mrs Upton against the decision of Mid Sussex District Council.
 - The application Ref is DM/25/1084.
 - The development proposed is conversion of part of the existing garage and associated alterations to the workshop, laundry, guest accommodation and associated facilities, including alteration and loft conversion, to provide additional living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The proposed alterations, although not significantly increasing the height of the roof, would substantially alter the roof form of the off-shot and significantly alter the appearance of this projection. The dormer windows would project above the roof ridge and beyond the roof slopes and would appear as wide large additions that would have a prominent appearance within the roof. The overall large alterations to the roof would create a development of top heavy roof design that would not appear as subordinate additions to the off-shot. Further to this, the varying window forms, both within the elevations and the roof, would create a disjointed appearance to the off-shot.
4. I accept that the off-shot in its altered form would remain a subordinate structure to that of the host dwelling. Nonetheless, the form and design of the alterations to the off-shot, having a large flat roofed appearance, horizontal proportions and disjointed fenestration, would not relate well to the roof pitches and vertical proportions of the host dwelling. Therefore, I do not agree with the appellant that the contemporary design approach for the off-shot would blend with the context of the replacement farmhouse, even if of modern design in itself. Contrary to this view, the alterations to the off-shot would be visually jarring as they would not successfully visually assimilate with the new farmhouse.

5. The harm arising from the proposed development would be clearly visible in public views from the public footpath to the west of the appeal property. The retaining wall and vegetation would not screen the proposal sufficiently from such public views that would obviate the visual harm arising from the proposal.
6. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The proposal would, therefore conflict with Policies DP12 and DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policy EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan, the Mid Sussex Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies seek development, amongst other matters, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings and replacement dwellings, to be well designed while being sensitive to the countryside. The SPD seeks extensions to respond to the design of the original dwelling and to be of simple, uncomplicated building form to complement and coordinate with the scale, form and massing of the original dwelling.
7. I acknowledge that the roof extensions would make better use of the space within the off-shot and that adapting the space within it would provide increased living space for the appellants and their family. Whilst this is a personal benefit for the appellants, this does not outweigh the visual harm arising from the development, as set out above, and does not justify the proposed development.
8. I have been referred to a contemporary new home that has been granted planning permission by the Council at Fen Place Mill, to which I am advised is a very sizeable contemporary dwelling. I have not been provided the full details of that case that would enable me to determine what similarity, if any, that development would have to the proposal that is before me. Notwithstanding this, that proposal relates to a different location in which different considerations will have applied. The proposal before me can and should be considered on its own individual merits taking into consideration the context of the site.

Conclusion

9. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR