



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2025

by H Miles BA (hons), MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/D/25/3372682

More House, Copyhold Lane, Cuckfield, West Sussex RH17 5EB

- 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 Malcolm Avery of Places Architects against the decision of Mid Sussex District Council.
 - The application Ref is DM/25/1336.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing rear conservatory and construction of new rear ground and first floor extension to form ground floor dining room and kitchen, and extension to first floor bedroom. External works to building surrounding area, new door to replace ground floor window on south elevation.
-

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.

Reasons

3. More House was designed by Henry Turner, a prominent local architect. It is a modest house in an Arts and Crafts style. This house includes features that are characteristic of his work such as a prominent and detailed central chimney, a hipped and catslide roof, curved metal eaves brackets and oriel windows including decorative glass. More House has been extended with a subservient and visually distinct conservatory to the rear. A number of the windows have also been changed. More House is not statutorily listed and is one of a number of Turner designed houses in the surrounding area. Nevertheless, the distinctive historic features identified above contribute to the property having a limited degree of heritage significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. Therefore, this property is considered as a non-designated heritage asset.
4. The neighbouring property at the Crossways has a corresponding design and features. This house has been extended to the side with an addition that is lower than the main roof and reflects the appearance of the property. However, the similarities between these two houses are clearly apparent, and they form a pair.
5. The proposed development would introduce a large part single and part two storey extension to the rear of the property. The single storey element would extend across the majority of the width of the building, although it would be set in from the sides, and its elevations would be mainly glazed. The two storey addition would be a long and narrow extension with a tiled pitched roof which is cranked at the base,

with a matching eaves level but with a ridge lower than the main roof height. The elevations would be in brick with windows, including a leaded window at first floor, to the rear elevation only.

6. This would be a substantial addition relative to the size of More House. The two storey element in particular would be long and would have a lack of detailing to the side elevation. This results in a large blank elevation. Furthermore, whilst its width would be more limited, its proportions would result in an extended narrow addition which would appear harmfully at odds with the design of the original dwelling. Taken together with the ground floor extension, even though these elevations would be glazed, the scale, form and massing would be excessive and discordant. This would be visually jarring and would unacceptably dominate the character and more modest form of the existing building.
7. The addition would obscure original rear windows, although I understand that these would be replaced under permitted development rights in any case. However, it would not alter or remove the other historic details identified above. Nevertheless, the scale and detailing of the proposed addition would harmfully undermine the character of this historic property for the reasons above. Balancing the scale of the harm against the significance of the non-designated heritage asset, there would be limited harm in this regard.
8. The proposed development would facilitate the removal of the conservatory, however for the reasons above the appeal scheme would be notably more harmful than the existing subservient and modest addition. Also, there is mature landscaping along Copyhold Lane, which would mainly screen the views from this road. Nonetheless, the extension would be highly visible from the surrounding properties and therefore the harm would be experienced.
9. The proposed development would result in an increase in internal living space, however this would mainly be a private benefit for existing occupiers. As such it would not outweigh the public and permanent harm to character and appearance.
10. I also note that there have been changes since a previously refused application. However, I have assessed the appeal on the basis of the details before me now and I nevertheless find the proposed development to be harmful for the reasons set out above.
11. Therefore, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to policies DP26 and DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031 (2018) and CNP1 and CNP10 of the Cuckfield Neighbourhood Plan (2014). Together these seek high quality designs that reflect the distinctive character of the area, extensions that fit with the existing building and to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

H Miles INSPECTOR