

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/1084	Case Officer:	Caroline Grist
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	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 space.		
Site:	Hurley Farm, Turners Hill Road, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 4LB, , ,		
Validation Date	4 Jun 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	1 Jul 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Refusal	Recommendation Date:	29 Jul 2025
Target Date:	30 Jul 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Caroline Grist</i>

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	0
--	--	-------------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	30 Jul 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/1084

**Hurley Farm, Turners Hill Road, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 4LB, ,
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 space.
Mr And Mrs Upton**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

No representations have been received in response to this application.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Tree Officer

I have reviewed the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) for this proposal, and I have no objection.

Please do condition adherence to the Arboricultural Method Statement found within the AIA.

TOWN COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No comment.

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought to 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 space.

RECENT PLANNING HISTORY

GR/071/99 - Conversion of redundant barn to light industrial use with ancillary storage. Permission.

GR/298/96 - Conversion of existing garage to offices in conjunction with existing business. Permission.

08/01830/COU - Conversion of office blocks 2 and 4 to holiday lets. Conversion of workshop and extension block 1 to provide garages and workshop in connection with the dwelling house and link infill to workshop block 3 converted to utility space at ground floor and hobby/games room at first floor and link to main house. Permission.

DM/18/4503 - Demolition of existing 4 bedroom dwelling, construction of replacement dwelling. Permission.

DM/19/2697 - Variation of condition 2 relating to planning application DM/18/4503 (Demolition of existing 4 bedroom dwelling and construction of replacement dwelling) to allow for revised plans to amend the design reducing the footprint. Permission.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Hurley Farm is a north facing, two storey, detached dwelling. It is a recent construction, replacing a previous dwelling, and is of a modern, Scandinavian design. The house itself is finished in white render, with grey vertical cladding at the first floor level and has a grey tiled roof. The application relates to an

off-shot to the north of the dwelling, which is a brick structure with red and brown roof tiles. It is a single storey structure with limited first floor space.

The site is located outside of the built up area of East Grinstead and is therefore within the countryside. Neighbouring houses are to the south of the site, woodland is to the west and fields surround the rest of the dwelling. The dwelling is accessed from Turners Hill Road, which is to the south of the site, where an access continues along the west of the property. It is also a public footpath.

APPLICATION DETAILS

This application relates to the northern off-shot of the dwelling, which is connected to the house by a glazed link. The existing floor plans show that the space is currently used as a garage, workshop, W.Cs, boiler room and laundry on the ground floor. There is a single room, within the eaves, that is used as guest accommodation.

It is proposed to convert this space into additional living accommodation. The floor plans show that the garage is to be retained on the ground floor. A utility room, kitchen, snug, dining room, living room, store and bathroom are to be created on the ground floor. On the first floor, three bedrooms, one with an en-suite, and a shower room are to be created.

In order to create this space, works are proposed to the roof that would first include increasing the ridge height by some 0.2 metres. Two flat roof dormer windows are proposed on the on the western roofslope, one of which would be some 5.4 metres wide and the other 6.3 metres wide. Both are to be approximately 2.4 metres deep and would sit 0.3 metres above the new roof line. A further dormer window is proposed on the western elevation that is to be some 13.2 metres wide. It would be approximately 2.0 metres deep and also protrude 0.3 metres above the new ridge height. Two feature windows are also proposed within it, one of which would project some 0.3 metres beyond the elevation and the other 0.5 metres. A further flat roof enlargement is proposed to accommodate the main bedroom. It is to be set back some 5.5 metres from the western elevation and would have a width of 4.7 metres and depth of 5.3 metres. It is to sit a further 0.5 metres above the new ridge line.

It is proposed to finish the elevations in white render, with sections of cladding proposed on the garage and a section of zinc on the western elevation. The roof and its associated enlargements are also to be finished in zinc cladding.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND LIST OF POLICIES

Planning legislation holds that the determination of a planning application shall be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Using this as the starting point the development plan for this part of Mid Sussex consists of the District Plan, Site Allocation Development Plan Document (DPD) and the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan.

National policy (which is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy Guidance) does not form part of the development plan, but is an important material consideration.

Mid Sussex District Plan

The District Plan was adopted at Full Council on 28th March 2018.

Relevant policies:

DP12 - Protection and Enhancement of Countryside

DP26 - Character and Design

Site Allocations DPD

The SADPD was adopted on 29th June 2022. It allocates sufficient housing and employment land to meet identified needs to 2031.

There are no relevant policies.

East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan

The East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan was formally made on 2nd November 2016.

Relevant policies:

Policy EG3 - Promoting Good Design

Other Material Considerations

Mid Sussex District Plan 2021 - 2039 - Submission Draft (Regulation 19)

The District Council is reviewing and updating the District Plan. Upon adoption, the new District Plan 2021 - 2039 will replace the current District Plan 2014-2031 and its policies will have full weight. In accordance with the NPPF, Local Planning Authorities may give weight to relevant policies of the emerging plan according to the stage of preparation; the extent to which there are unresolved objections to the relevant policies; and the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the NPPF. The draft District Plan 2021-2039 (Regulation 19) is currently at Examination and the stage 1 hearings were concluded on the 31st October 2024. There are unresolved objections to some of the policies in the draft District Plan and as such, only minimal weight can be given to the Plan and this planning application has been assessed against the policies of the adopted District Plan.

Relevant policies:

DPS2 - Sustainable Design and Construction

DPS6 - Health and Wellbeing

DPC1 - Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside

DPB1 - Character and Design

Mid Sussex Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

The Council has adopted a 'Mid Sussex Design Guide' SPD that aims to help deliver high quality development across the district that responds appropriately to its context and is inclusive and sustainable. The Design Guide was adopted by Council on 4th November 2020 as an SPD for use in the consideration and determination of planning applications. The SPD is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024)

ASSESSMENT

Design and impact on the character of the surrounding area

The proposed development is located within the countryside, therefore policy DP12 of the District Plan is relevant. The principal aim of Policy DP12 of the District Plan states the

'countryside will be protected in recognition of its intrinsic character and beauty.'

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states:

'All development and surrounding spaces, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings and replacement dwellings, will be well designed and reflect the distinctive character of the towns and villages while being sensitive to the countryside. All applicants will be required to demonstrate that development:

- o is of high quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace;*
- o contributes positively to, and clearly defines, public and private realms and should normally be designed with active building frontages facing streets and public open spaces to animate and provide natural surveillance;*

- o creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape;
- o protects open spaces, trees and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;
- o protects valued townscapes and the separate identity and character of towns and villages;
- o does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings, including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight, and noise, air and light pollution (see Policy DP27);
- o creates a pedestrian-friendly layout that is safe, well connected, legible and accessible;
- o incorporates well integrated parking that does not dominate the street environment, particularly where high density housing is proposed;
- o positively addresses sustainability considerations in the layout and the building design;
- o take the opportunity to encourage community interaction by creating layouts with a strong neighbourhood focus/centre; larger (300+ unit) schemes will also normally be expected to incorporate a mixed use element;
- o optimises the potential of the site to accommodate development.'

East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan policy EG3 states:

'Planning permission will normally be granted where development proposals meet the following criteria:

- o *The form of the proposed development is proportionate and in keeping with the scale, height, materials and site coverage of the surrounding area;*
- o *The layout of the proposed development respects the topography and character of the site, protects important landscape features and does not harm adjoining amenity;*
- o *The proposal does not result in the loss of buildings or spaces that would have an unacceptable impact on the character of the area;*
- o *The proposal ensures satisfactory means of access for vehicles and pedestrians and provides adequate parking, cycle storage and refuse facilities on site;*
- o *The design of new buildings and the layout of spaces, including footways, car and cycle parking areas, should be permeable and provide connectivity with neighbouring areas;*
- o *New development must be inclusive and where appropriate make satisfactory provision for the safe and easy access for those with mobility impairment; and*
- o *The design of new developments must result in the creation of a safe and secure environment and incorporate adequate security measures and features to deter crime, fear of crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour; and*
- o *Proposals make provision for green infrastructure and biodiversity enhancement'.*

The Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD also provides advice for extensions to dwellings. Principle DG49 states that:

'Extensions should respond to the design of the original dwelling and applicants will be expected to demonstrate how local character has informed the design proposal. Extensions should also normally be designed to be well-integrated with the existing scale, form and massing allowing the original building to remain the dominant element of the property whether it has one or several additions.

Extensions should typically use simple, uncomplicated building forms to complement and coordinate with the scale, form and massing of the original dwelling. The design approach may benefit from coordinating with the existing pattern of window and door openings as well as employing facing materials to match those of the existing dwelling. Otherwise it should demonstrate the appropriateness of the alternative approach.

Extensions should not result in a significant loss to the private amenity area of the dwelling.

There are two general approaches to extending a property:

- o *Designing in the style of the existing building by closely matching its facing materials, architectural features, window sizes and proportions; and*
- o *Designing in a contemporary style that takes its cues from key aspects of the existing building that might include its underlying form and proportions, facing materials, window design and other specific*

architectural features. The success of this approach is particularly reliant on high quality facing materials and finishes, and this will normally need to be demonstrated through detailed elevations and section drawings.

Both approaches can create successful, well-designed extensions that can be mutually beneficial to both the house and the wider area'.

With regards to loft conversions and roof extensions, principle DG52 of the Design Guide sets out:

'A loft conversion is a space efficient means of extending the amount of living accommodation in a dwelling. Roof accommodation is normally reliant on dormer windows and rooflights to provide light and ventilation. However, if they are out of scale or out of character with the roofscape and proportions of a dwelling they can have an adverse impact on the character of both the dwelling and the streetscape.

The roof pitch and form are intrinsic to a building's character and roof extensions should be sensitive to this. Roof extensions and dormer windows that alter the existing ridge of the roof or significantly alter the roof profile of a building will not normally be acceptable, particularly on the front roof slope, and where there is a strong established roofline.

Where a clear rhythm of fenestration is established, the position and proportion of dormer windows should respond to existing windows and / or doors.

Further guidance on dormer windows and rooflights is provided in chapter 6 under sections 6.3.5 to 6.3.8..

Paragraphs 6.3.5 to 6.3.8 go on to state:

'6.3.5 While dormer windows can sometimes be prominent features in the streetscene, care needs to be taken with their design, proportions and position on the roof. The choice of design should be informed by the character and appearance of the local vernacular.

6.3.6 Dormer windows should be visually subordinate to the roof slope, enabling a large proportion of the main roof to remain visible. Excessively wide dormers are likely to look unsatisfactory as they will often be out of proportion with the existing roof.

6.3.7 Dormer windows should normally be positioned below the ridge-line, and above the eaves line.

6.3.8 Rooflights that follow the roof profile can be an appropriate substitute for a dormer where it is important to retain the profile of the roof slope or avoid a dormer that break the eaves line. Care though needs to be taken to avoid them dominating the roof. Rooflights are best designed with a slender-profile that are flush with the roof slope'.

The application relates to a detached, modern, dwelling that is of a Scandinavian design. It sits away from surrounding houses and is at a higher land level than the access to the west.

Planning permission is sought for works to the northern offshot of the building in order to provide additional living space. In order to create additional bedrooms, works are proposed to enlarge the space available at the first floor level. These works would include increasing the main ridge height, three dormer windows and a first floor enlargement.

As set out within the Design Guide, it is expected that extensions should be designed to respond appropriately to the host dwelling and ensure that they would remain subordinate. Whilst it is acknowledged that the existing off shot is an older structure and is of a more traditional appearance, it is considered that it responds well to the main house and it appears appropriately subordinate. The existing roof height and simple, low key form of the structure are considered to be factors that contribute to this.

The proposed works seek changes to the roof form and to alter the appearance of this projection. Whilst the majority of the roof is to be increased by 0.2 metres, the dormer windows would sit proud of this and there would be an additional increase of approximately 1 metre to accommodate the main bedroom.

Furthermore the proposed dormer windows are large and wide and appear prominent on the roofslopes. As such the works as a whole would significantly alter the roof profile and it is considered that this would create a top heavy roof design. The scale and form of the dormer windows and first floor addition add to this, as their design does not appear subordinate, and, overall it is considered that it would appear prominent and would visually compete with the host dwelling.

The proposal includes other works to this projection, such as feature windows. When viewing the elevations as a whole these features alongside the works to the roof appear cluttered and disjointed. They appear to relate more successfully to the floorplan, rather creating cohesive elevations. The detailed design would also reflect this, such as through the number of different window designs shown.

In terms of the wider impact, it is considered that the form and detail of the proposal would also not relate successfully to the host dwelling. This is highlighted in the western and northern elevations, where the proposed works appear boxy and horizontally proportioned in contrast to the pitches and more vertical proportions in the host dwelling. The higher flat roof of the first floor addition also appears discordant in the context of the adjoining pitched roofs of the main house. Additionally there would be views to the proposed works from the public footpath to the west. Whilst part of the elevations would be screened due to the changing land levels and the existing garden, the roof remains visible. This is particularly the case closest to the main house where the majority of the first floor works are to take place.

In response to these concerns being set out to the applicant, the following matters were raised:

- o You note that the traditional front projection and modern main house "sit comfortably together" and that the projection is "appropriately subordinate." We agree the current relationship is successful, but our client wishes to update the design of the front element to better reflect and complement the contemporary character of the main house. The intention is not to compete, but to harmonise the two elements under a unified architectural language.*
- o The proposed 200mm ridge height increase is minor and remains clearly subordinate to the main ridge, which sits approximately 3.8m higher. This change is de minimis and does not upset the hierarchy between the original house and the extension. The visual impact of the adjusted roof height will be negligible, particularly in the context of the larger, taller main house.*
- o The proposed dormers are designed with sloping roofs to optimise headroom, light, and ventilation. These are clearly readable as dormers and remain visually subordinate within the roofscape. Their contemporary form is entirely consistent with the architectural language of the main house.*
- o The section of higher roof over the master bedroom is deliberately set back from the courtyard and from the main house. This ensures it reads as a recessive and independent form, not as a dominant or competing mass.*
- o The Mid Sussex Design Guide and Dormer Window SPD both appear to lean heavily towards traditional vernacular examples. All 9 dormer illustrations shown are based on historic buildings. There is no guidance or illustration addressing contemporary dormers in a modern architectural context, such as this. We would suggest that the current guidance is not fully equipped to assess well-designed, contemporary additions and would benefit from evolution to support innovative architecture, as encouraged by the NPPF.*
- o We also note that the Dormer SPD uses language such as "bulky and prominent additions which spoil the appearance of buildings" — language that appears pre-judged rather than objective. The dormers proposed here are proportionate to the large roof volume in which they sit and remain clearly subordinate.*
- o On the subject of high-quality design, we would refer you to page 15 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide, which features a bold, contemporary building (possibly "The Spiral") as an exemplar of "exceptional design in the countryside." This demonstrates an appetite for design innovation in the district — a principle our scheme follows at a more modest scale, in a domestic setting.*
- o It is also notable that within Sussex, and in areas very similar to Mid Sussex, permission has been granted for high-quality contemporary architecture in both rural and residential settings. One example is North Farm House (West Sussex), a contemporary dwelling approved in a rural location, where its modern form and sensitive materiality were accepted as appropriate in context. Another is Close Up, a modern housing scheme in Isfield that won the Sussex Heritage Trust's 2024 Mid-Scale Residential Award. It showcases how a contemporary design approach, with a variety of forms and materials, can be entirely compatible with local character when well-considered. There is also the very local Fen Place Mill referenced within our supporting documentation (on the adjacent site to the west,*

with a variety of fenestration, including dormers). These examples support our view that the use of contemporary dormers and fenestration is not inappropriate, and indeed, aligns with a broader pattern of successful, high-quality modern design within the county.

o With regard to fenestration, the main house already includes a range of contemporary window forms and styles. The proposed window types continue this approach and are carefully selected to meet our client's functional needs and maintain visual coherence with the main dwelling. Moreover, most proposed windows are not visible from the public realm.

o The existing traditional form of the front projection will still be legible after the alterations — the overall scale and footprint remain modest and respectful.

o Finally, regarding views from the public right of way: while we acknowledge there is limited visibility from a section of the footpath, the impact is minimal and has been clearly illustrated within the submitted Planning, Design & Access Statement. The proposed changes will be perceived only in glimpsed views, filtered by existing planting. We would also note that no objections have been raised by local residents or users of the footpath.

Whilst concerns have been raised regarding the proposal, no issues have been raised regarding the principle of undertaking works to this part of the building. The issues lie with the scale, form and design of the proposal. The proposal not only seeks to increase the ridge height by 0.2 metres but includes other aspects as well that go beyond this. The windows found in the main house consistently reflect the overall shape and form of the dwelling, whereas those proposed remain varied in their size and design across the elevations.

With regards to the Design Guide, it establishes principles to ensure a high standard of design across Mid Sussex. As set out under DG49, a contemporary design approach can successfully be used to extend a dwelling where it takes cues from the existing building. A consistent requirement is that additions should allow the host dwelling to remain the dominant element and further guidance on dormer windows is set out under paragraphs 6.3.5 to 6.3.8. It does not state that a contemporary cannot be taken for dormer windows and a range of examples are provided. As such it is considered that this document remains a relevant material consideration.

It therefore remains the view that the proposed development would create a top heavy design that would appear overly dominant in relation to the host dwelling. Furthermore, the overall design would appear cluttered and disjointed and would not relate sympathetically to the main house. The proposal would be visible from public vantage points and would create an incongruous addition to the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with Policies DP12 and DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policy EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan, the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Impact to neighbouring amenity

Policy EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan states that proposals should "not harm" adjoining neighbours amenity whereas policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states that development should not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings, including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight, and noise, air and light pollution. There is therefore some conflict between the District Plan and Neighbourhood Plan in this respect. Under section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 if a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan, the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approved or published. As such, policy DP26 is considered to take precedence and therefore the test in this instance is whether the development causes significant harm to neighbouring amenities as outlined above.

Due to the position of the proposed development, away from neighbouring properties, it is considered that a harmful impact would not arise regarding light, outlook or privacy.

Given the domestic nature of the proposal there would not be a significantly harmful impact in terms of noise, air or light pollution.

Biodiversity Net Gain

Biodiversity net gain is required under a statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This is a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. As a householder application this development is exempt from the requirement to provide biodiversity net gain.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

In conclusion it is considered that the proposed development would create a top heavy design that would appear overly dominant in relation to the host dwelling. Furthermore, the overall design would appear cluttered and disjointed and would not relate sympathetically to the main house. The proposal would be visible from public vantage points and would create an incongruous addition to the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with Policies DP12 and DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policy EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan, the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Decision: Refusal

Case Officer: Caroline Grist