



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 28 January 2026

by J Moore BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st April 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/D3830/W/25/3373522

8 Newstone Cottages, East Street, Turners Hill, West Sussex RH10 4PX

- 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 Barry Liles against the decision of Mid Sussex District Council.
- The application Ref is DM/25/1248.
- The development proposed is: proposed garage and rear/side extension to provide cloakroom and bedroom.

Appeal B Ref: APP/D3830/Y/25/3373520

8, Newstone Cottages, East Street, Turners Hill, West Sussex RH10 4PX

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Barry Liles against the decision of Mid Sussex District Council.
 - The application Ref is DM/25/1249.
 - The works proposed are: proposed garage and rear/side extension to provide cloakroom and bedroom.
-

Decisions

1. Both Appeal A and Appeal B are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Both appeals relate to the same proposal under different but complementary legislation. Where possible, I have therefore dealt with both appeals together in my reasoning. However, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated.
3. After the case was allocated to me, I was unable to open certain electronic documents submitted by the appellant and the files were ultimately resupplied. In seeking confirmation that the documents were the same as those originally submitted and upon which the views of the Council and interested parties were sought, it transpired that only the appeal statement had previously been available. In addition, the appellant advised that minor annotations had been made to a document to identify properties in images. In the interests of fairness and natural justice, I therefore gave an opportunity for the Council and interested parties to make further comments on these documents, and I am satisfied that no party has been prejudiced by this matter.
4. A revised Mid Sussex District Plan (MSDP) has been submitted for examination. There are unresolved objections to the plan, and no policies of the emerging plan are cited in the reasons for refusal. I therefore attach limited weight to the emerging plan in my consideration of the appeals.

5. The proposal concerns a listed building located within a conservation area (CA). As required by sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act), I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; and paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.

Main Issues

6. The main issues are the effects of the proposal upon the special architectural or historic interest of the Grade II listed building 'New Cottages'¹, known as Nos 7 and 8 Newstone Cottages, of which the appeal property is part; and upon the character or appearance of the Turners Hill CA.

Reasons

Special Interest and significance

7. Newstone Cottages comprise five pairs of two-storey, semi-detached cottages of a modest scale. Each pair is Grade II listed, and the list entries for the other listed pairs are before me². All entries are dated 1992 and detail the group value of the cottages which number consecutively (Nos1-10). The cottages date from 1919 and are a planned, formal development in the Arts and Crafts style. Shared architectural details to all elevations include snecked rubble masonry to the ground floor with stone mullioned leaded windows; and timber framing with close studding and curved braces at the first floor. Roof forms are hipped and include tall chimney stacks with brick detailing.
8. Each pair is not identical. The outer pairs (Nos 1-2 and 9-10) are mirrored forms with a rear wing and are sited closer to the highway such that the development forms a U shape. Nos 3-4 and 7-8 are also mirrored forms, but the central pair at Nos 5-6 is distinctive with a central niche and statue. The outer pairs include three chimney stacks, while the three central pairs have only one. Consequently, the outer pairs appear as grander bookends to the development. Other variations include the placement and size of openings.
9. From the evidence before me and my own observations, each pair has been modified over time, including additions prior to the date of listing and/or the designation of the CA in 1984. These include single storey detached garages within side spaces, with flat or hipped roofs which do not significantly detract from the form and style of the cottages. Rear additions are of varying scale, form, materials and detailing and none occupy the full width of the plot.
10. The appeal property benefits from a rear conservatory of a considerable scale, being deeper than the kitchen and occupying almost the full width of its rear elevation, with a pitched roof running parallel to the hipped roof of the LB. It is of painted timber frame construction with a brick dwarf wall/plinth, and otherwise fully glazed. This appears to be the subject of permission and consent circa 2002³. The adjoining property at No 7 also benefits from a smaller, semi-circular glazed conservatory attached to part of the rear elevation. Both additions appear as relatively lightweight structures.

¹ List Entry number 1240540 (Nos 7 and 8)

² List Entry Refs: 1039931 (Nos 1 and 2); 1039932 (Nos 3 and 4); 1039930 (Nos 5 and 6); 1260962 (Nos 9 and 10).

³ Refs: 02/00763/FUL and 02/00762/LBC.

11. Drawing all the above together, I find that the special interest and significance of the listed building (LB) at Nos 7 and 8 to primarily derive from its architectural interest and group value. The main contributors are the architectural detailing and materials of all original elevations reflective of the Arts and Crafts style; the modest scale of the cottage pairs; and the symmetry and consistency of the group.
12. The CA includes the village centre and extends along routes towards the north, east and west. From the evidence before me, its significance stems in part from its location at the convergence of historic routes at a steep ridge within the Sussex Weald; and from attractive groupings of period buildings, which are predominantly in the Victorian/Edwardian style, with some dating from the 17th century. Materials are largely red brick and include hanging tile, typical of the Sussex vernacular. Stone is also common in ground floor elevations and walling. Insofar as related to the appeals, I find the significance of the CA to be primarily associated with the architectural interest and grouping of its period buildings, including the distinctive and planned group at Newstone Cottages.

Effects

13. The proposal would result in a single storey extension which would adjoin the existing conservatory and meet the side boundary of the plot. In addition, the proposal includes a detached garage sited within the side space of the plot. It would share the same front building line as the cottage and meet the side boundary, leaving a pathway alongside the flank of the cottage and before the proposed extension. The proposed garage would not harm the fabric of the LB. Due to its scale, design, materials and roof form, it would harmonise with the LB and would not undermine the character or appearance of the group or the CA as a whole.
14. Due to its scale and siting, the proposed extension would project slightly forward of the deep rear wall of the original cottage, such that it would obscure its rear corner. Cumulatively, the proposed extension and conservatory would occupy the full width of the plot. Their combined footprint would be disproportionate to the original footprint and plan form of the cottage, generating an overbearing effect to the original form and scale of the LB. The proposed flat roof would be discordant to both the hipped roof form of the LB and the pitched roof form of the conservatory, resulting in an awkward effect.
15. Certain elements of the proposed extension would be sympathetic to the design and materials of the LB. These include stone quoins to the front elevation and stone saddleback coping to the flat roof. Although the surrounding stonework and materials of the proposed window in the front elevation would be consistent with the LB, the window would fail to follow the proportions of the windows in the LB. The proposed French doors and brick wall/plinth at the rear elevation would harmonise with those of the conservatory. However, the remaining solid faces of the elevations would be a decorated render, which would be discordant to the materials used in the LB and the conservatory.
16. Drawing all the above together, the proposed extension and rear conservatory would cumulatively dominate the modest scale, footprint and rear elevation of the LB. Overall, the solid to void ratio, design and materials of the proposed extension would be at variance with the established character of the modified LB. The proposal would therefore erode the special interest of the LB and diminish the

group value of the listed cottages. This would harm the character and appearance of this attractive group of period buildings, which are a key contributor to the significance of the CA.

17. The appellant draws my attention to other cottages and the nature of their additions and suggests that the proposal would be no more harmful. Although the full details of the circumstances which led to each addition are not before me, it is not a matter of dispute that some additions took place before the listing and/or designation of the CA, and the main parties appear to agree that certain additions are not entirely sympathetic to the original cottages. While the appellant suggests that design would have been a consideration in decision making at that time, this is not robustly demonstrated and of itself, does not justify the proposal or set aside the statutory duties for designated heritage assets.
18. Most notable in terms of scale is a flat roofed rear extension at No 6, which occupies the full width of the rear elevation to a point beyond the flank elevation. However, the Council advises that a permission for a rear extension was granted circa 1969, and a subsequent proposal made in 2016 to modify this extension was approved, which appears to have resulted in more extensive glazing. Moreover, the appellant does not dispute that this addition occupies less footprint than the proposal before me. Therefore, I do not find this example to be directly comparable. The rear extension at No 4 is also of some scale and flat roofed, but it does not occupy the full width of the rear elevation. While materials include cast stone of a lighter colour than the weathered natural stone of its host, it also includes extensive glazing and appears as a relatively lightweight addition.
19. In any event, the fact of the matter is that no other cottage has a rear addition that occupies the full width of the plot. Consequently, I do not find other additions provide a precedent for this proposal.
20. The appellant is of the opinion that the proposed extension would not be harmful as it would be behind the proposed garage and not seen from the street. However, listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest irrespective of whether or not public views of the building are available. Limited public views have little bearing on the effect upon the CA, as I am duty bound to consider the effect upon the CA as a whole. During my visit, I saw that the proposed extension would likely be visible from the parking area at the entrance to Noah's Court, despite the variance in levels, boundary treatments, and intervening vegetation, particularly when not in leaf. It would therefore be capable of harming the wider character or appearance of the CA.
21. Given the above, I find that the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the LB; and it would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. This would harm the special interest and significance of these designated heritage assets.

Public benefits and balance

22. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets and that any such harm should have a clear and convincing justification. Given the scale of the proposal, I

find the harm to be less than substantial in this instance and at the lower end of that spectrum, but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. In such circumstances, I am required to weigh this harm against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

23. The appellant states that the occupiers are in their mature years, with medical conditions that require a downstairs toilet. Further, that the additional space could be used as a bedroom as required to meet the demands of increasing age and decreasing mobility, avoiding the demands of moving home.
24. I have therefore had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which requires me to consider the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not. The relevant protected characteristics include age and disability. The proposal would lead to enhanced accommodation that could meet the needs of occupiers who share those protected characteristics. However, I do not have sufficient or detailed evidence upon which to consider whether the needs of any person would fall within the auspices of the PSED. Therefore, I am unable to assess whether such a need would form a justification for the proposed development that would otherwise be denied on account of any protected characteristic under the PSED. Nonetheless, I have still attached some limited positive weight to the personal circumstances of the occupiers.
25. Furthermore, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal is the only way to achieve the objective, nor that it is the least harmful option. Therefore, from the details before me, it has not been robustly demonstrated that there is an over-riding reason to allow the proposal in order to meet the appellant's objectives. As such, this matter does not outweigh the harm I have found. If I were to dismiss the appeals, it would be in the wider public interest of designated heritage assets. For these reasons, I attach limited positive weight to the personal circumstances of the occupiers. Temporary economic benefits would also arise during the construction phase, limited only by the scale of the works.
26. There is no compelling evidence to demonstrate that the continued viable use of the property as a residential dwelling is dependent on the proposal, or that such a use would cease if I were to dismiss the appeals.
27. Collectively, the public benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the less than substantial harm that I have found, to which I am required to attach great weight. I therefore conclude that on balance, the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the Grade II LB; and fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the Framework.
28. The proposal would conflict with Policies DP26, DP34 and DP35 of the MSDP and Policy THP7 of the Turners Hill Neighbourhood Plan 2016. Taken together, these policies seek to ensure that development is well designed and reflects distinctive character; and that development including extensions to listed buildings and within conservation areas respects significance, historic form, scale and materials. In respect of Appeal A, the proposed development would not be in accordance with the development plan.

Other Matters

29. Interested parties query the availability of drone video. For the avoidance of doubt, there is no drone footage before me, but rather a document which includes images taken by a drone. While I note support for the proposal from the Parish Council, such support does not render the proposal acceptable.

Conclusion

30. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

J Moore

INSPECTOR