



EAST GRINSTEAD TOWN COUNCIL

Council Offices, East Court, College Lane, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 3LT

Phone: 01342 323636

www.eastgrinstead.gov.uk

Town Clerk: Samantha Heynes BA (Hons), FSLCC

Email: townclerk@eastgrinstead.gov.uk

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7pm on Thursday 2nd July 2026

Committee: Cllr L Gibbs (Chair)
Cllr E Godwin (Vice Chair)
Cllr J Mockford*
Cllr S Ody
Cllr A Peacock*
Cllr T Scott
Cllr R Whittaker*

* absent

In Attendance: Town Clerk

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

No members of the public were present.

18. **To receive apologies for absence/substitutions**

Apologies were received from Cllrs Mockford, Peacock and Whittaker, which were noted.

19. **To receive the minutes of the meeting held on 11th June 2026**

RESOLVED: The previously circulated minutes of the meeting held on 11th June 2026 were agreed by the Committee and signed by the Chairman.

20. **To receive Members' Declarations of Interest**

None.

21. **To receive a verbal report from the Chairman**

The item to review potential sites for the District Plan had been considered at last week's Full Council meeting on 25th June 2026. It was noted that the site next to KFC in town had been sold to new owners in January 2026, no further information was available at this time but it was hoped there would be improvements made to this site at the earliest opportunity.

22. **To note the Planning Action List (Appendix A)**

It was noted that lorries serving the Evergreen site had been observed travelling faster than the 20mph limit at school drop off and pick up times, this would be flagged with the site foreman.

The response to the consultation of potential sites for inclusion in MSDC's District Plan had been submitted on 26th June, closing this action. Further updates regarding the District Plan would return to the committee as new agenda items.

23. **To make observations as may be considered necessary in respect of the planning applications (Appendix B)**

RESOLVED: That Mid Sussex District Council be informed of the observations of this Committee in relation to the applications set out in the Appendix B to these minutes, as indicated in column 5.

24. **To note any planning and/or appeal decisions received from Mid Sussex District Council attached (Appendix C)**

The decisions were noted by the Committee as detailed in Appendix C.

The meeting closed at 7.30pm.

The next meeting of the Planning Committee will be held on **Thursday 23rd July 2026 at 7pm.**

Signed

Chair

Committee	Orginal Meeting	Min No	Details	Date	Action by	Comments	Status
Planning	PS	307	Re Evergreen Farm - to monitor response from WSCC	13/03/2025	RW	Cllr Rex Whittaker to be the liaison	Ongoing
Planning		4	Council should respond to the consultation and the response should be considered now, and information collated to assist with this in advance, which could include numbers of housing that East Grinstead has already been allocated.	21/05/2026	Deputy Clerk	Housing numbers received from MSDC circulated to Committee 12/06/26. Provisional consulation dates circulated by MSDC for 27 July-7 September. Meeting with MSDC Officers arranged for 17/06/26.	Ongoing

Planning Application No	Ward	Location	Proposal	EGTC Comments
DM/25/0351/FUL	Town South	S Taylors Jewellers 30 Cantelupe Road, East Grinstead	Proposal to convert the existing commercial space into a selfcontained residential flat, extend the current one-bedroom ground floor flat into a two-bedroom unit, install seven rooflights in the rear existing commercial space, add a new door and window on the side elevation, and raise the single-storey roof to match the existing structure. Remove garage door to provide parking spaces and bin store at front of property. Supporting Bat Emergence Survey received 02.06.2026. Amended Location Plan, Site Plan, Floor Plans and Elevation Plans received 16.06.2026 and 22.06.2026.	11/06/2026 - No comment
DM/26/1314/FUL	Town South	101-123 Orchard Way, East Grinstead, RH19 1AU	Renewal of existing timber balustrades with 2mm thick mild steel perforated panel held in by SHS25*25 balustrades. Renewal of rear private balcony balustrades with like for like material and design. Installing new deep-flow guttering to the property.	No comment
DM/26/1345/FUL	Baldwins	Land R/O 3 Park View Gardens Lingfield Road East Grinstead West Sussex	Erection of new dwelling (2 bed) with amenity space, cycle storage, refuse bins. Demolish existing garage.	Recommend refusal on the following basis: DP3 Village & Neighbourhood Centre Development, that any development is appropriate in is appropriate in scale and function to its location including the character and amenities of the surrounding area. The proposal is considered to be an overdevelopment of this site and the design proposed would not fit within the local area. A 2 storey building in this location would be overbearing for the neighbours creating a loss of privacy. Further to EG12 Car Parking and DP21 Transport, only 1 parking space would be allocated likely leading to on road parking, which was already very difficult in this location. This development would add more parking pressure to this area and therefore local environment.
DM/26/1348/LBC	Town North	17 The Old Convent East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 3RS	Remove existing roof tiles to allow pitched roof repairs. Reinstate original tiles to main pitched roof. Install new tiles to secondary pitched roof	No comment
DM/26/1387/HOU	Herontye & Ashplats South	Holmside Garden House Lane East Grinstead West Sussex	Proposed two storey rear extension.	No comment
DM/26/1389/HOU	Ashplats North	14 Lynton Park Avenue East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 3XB	Proposed retaining wall to rear of garden raising of garden level.	No comment
DM/26/1394/LDC	EG South	Fen Place Mill East Street Turners Hill Crawley	The building works consist of the main 'L' shape garage block, a four bay garage block, a double garage block, an outbuilding and the driveway / parking area within the residential curtilage	No comment
DM/26/1398/HOU	Ashplats North	2 Fairlight Cottage Holtye Road East Grinstead West Sussex	Demolish a section of the building to the south elevation and replace with a two storey extension. Erect a single storey extension to the west elevation.	No comment
DM/26/1419/TREE	Herontye & Ashplats South	Adjacent To 62 The Glades East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 3XW	European Hornbeam (within mixed woodland). Reduce crown by 4m	The committee supported approval subject to no adverse report from the MSDC tree officer.
DM/26/1436/TREE	Baldwins	15 Baldwins Field East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 2HE	(T1) Oak - selectively crown reduce up to 2m and remove epicormic growth on main stem	The committee supported approval subject to no adverse report from the MSDC tree officer.
DM/26/1444/HOU	Town South	5 Dexter Drive East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 4SU	Proposed rear 1st floor balcony over existing approved rear ground floor extension and to include a staircase from ground to 1st floor and adding patio doors to selected existing rear 1st floor windows.	No comment
DM/26/1446/HOU	Ashplats North	Little Shovelstrode Hall Holtye Road East Grinstead West Sussex	Conversion of stables to ancillary residential annex	No comment

Planning Application No	Ward	Location	Proposal	EGTC Comments
DM/26/1449/FUL	Town North	Development Site At Former Tower Car Sales Tower Close East Grinstead West Sussex	Retrospective application for the internal reconfiguration to provide 1no additional self-contained residential unit with 1no bedroom.	No comment
DM/26/1468/TREE	Baldwins	23 Springfield East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 2RT	T1 - Ash: Cut back branches overhanging 24 Springfield by 1.5m. T2 - Oak : Cut back branches overhanging 24 Springfield by 1.5m	The committee supported approval subject to no adverse report from the MSDC tree officer.
DM/26/1475/FUL	Imberhorne	Upper Woodside 29 Crescent Road East Grinstead West Sussex	Demolition of existing external concrete staircase. Erection of replacement external metal staircase and balcony above existing rear single storey extension. Minor alteration to rear hipped roof of extension to remove valley	No comment
DM/26/1501/TREE	Baldwins	25 Dorset Gardens East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 2SD	T1 Oak and T2 Oak - reduce canopy by 4m to suitable growth points, crown lift to 3m and crown thin by removing crossing and rubbing branches by 15%. T3 Oak - crown lift to 3m. T4, T5, T6, T7 and T8 - London Plane - reduce canopy by 4m to suitable growth points, crown lift to 3m and crown thin by removing crossing and rubbing branches by 15%. G1 Laurel - reduce in height by 2m to suitable growth points and trim face side by no more than .3 metres to shape.	The committee supported approval subject to no adverse report from the MSDC tree officer.
DM/26/1504/HOU	Herontye & Ashplats South	5 Cornwall Gardens East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 4TJ	Erection of a single storey rear extension incorporating a roof lantern, installation of a woodburning stove and associated external flue, alterations to fenestration, associated internal alterations and minor external regrading works to facilitate new garden steps.	No comment
DM/26/1506/HOU	Herontye & Ashplats South	16 Glendyne Way East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 4LS	Replacement of single storey timber summerhouse.	No comment
DM/26/1514/TREE	Baldwins	Stildon Brendoncare Nursing Home Dorset Avenue East Grinstead West Sussex	T1 - Oak Crown reduction by 1.5m. T2 - Oak Crown reduction by 2m. T3 - Yew Crown reduction by 2m. T4 - Yew crown lifted off by 2m to clear roof of bin store.	The committee supported approval subject to no adverse report from the MSDC tree officer.
DM/26/1548/TREE	Baldwins	Turret Court, London Road, East Grinstead	(T1) Oak tree - crown reduce by 2m. (T2) Sycamore - remove one large dead limb.	The committee supported approval subject to no adverse report from the MSDC tree officer.

Planning Application No	Ward	Location	Proposal	EGTC Comments	MSDC Decision
DM/26/0451/HOU	EG south	Cherry Hay Turners Hill Road East Grinstead West Sussex	Proposed single storey rear extension following replacement of existing conservatory. Single storey front entrance extension with extended roof to cover existing flat roof of bay window. Balustrading to existing first floor side balcony. Proposed detached carport. Arboricultural report received 27.04.2026	EGTC 17/03/2026 No comment.	Approved 19/06/2026
DM/26/0669/FUL	EG South	East Grinstead Sports Club Sports Field Saint Hill Road East Grinstead	Formation of Essential Additional Vehicle Parking at Multi-discipline Sports Facility	No comment	Refused 10/06/2026
DM/26/0716/HOU	Herontye & Ashplats South	12 Paddock Gardens East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 4AE	Proposed roof conversion with dormers and new open front porch.	No comment	Approved 16/06/2026
DM/26/0872/VOC	Town North	McDonald's 165 London Road East Grinstead West Sussex	Variation of condition no 11 relating to planning application GR/199/96 - to extend the restaurant's opening hours.	London Road was not a car park and Moat Road would at times be blocked due to traffic queuing to use McDonalds. Whilst it was noted that at peak times a staff member would be outside to attempt traffic control, this was difficult to achieve due to the site of the restaurant. A planning condition was requested at the time of the original planning permission, and the Town Council requested that this be enforced especially at all peak times.	Approved 23/06/2026
DM/26/0884/FUL	Town South	Pavement Opposite East Grinstead Library 40 West Street East Grinstead	The installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated BT payphones.	No comment	Approved 23/06/2026
DM/26/0885/ADV	Town South	Pavement Opposite East Grinstead Library 40 West Street East Grinstead	The installation of 1no. BT Street Hub and removal of associated BT payphones with 2no. digital 75" LCD display screens, one on each side of the Street Hub unit	No comment	Approved 23/06/2026
DM/26/0954/FUL	Town South	Wallis House Orchard Way East Grinstead West Sussex	Proposed cladding remediation works to remove combustible cladding elements, render systems and timber panels and replace them with materials and systems of limited combustibility and non-combustible materials.	No comment	Approved 23/06/2026
DM/26/1015/HOU	Town South	17 Church Lane East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 3AZ	Demolition of Conservatory and erection of rear/side extension plus internal modifications to garage and passageway to form new room.	No comment	Approved 22/06/2026
DM/26/1087/TREE	Imberhome	15 Sackville Close East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 2SG	Beech Tree - Fell.	The committee supported approval subject to no adverse report from the MSDC tree officer.	Approved 19/06/2026
DM/26/1118/HOU	Town South	9 Nightingale Close East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 4DG	Proposed 2 storey extension to rear and proposed porch to front elevation.	No comment	Approved 25/06/2026
DM/26/1152/TREE	Town North	Alice Crocker House St Johns Road East Grinstead West Sussex	G1 - Oak, Walnut, Silver Birch and Ash - Reduce crowns by up to 3m to suitable growth points to prevent any overhang into allotment grounds. T1 Dead Oak - remove to as close as possible to ground level.	The committee supported approval subject to no adverse report from the MSDC tree officer.	Approved 19/06/2026



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 May 2026

by John Pearce MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6002414

19 Estcots Drive, East Grinstead, West Sussex RH19 3DA

- 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 E Harradine of EMH Electrical and Building Services Ltd against the decision of Mid Sussex District Council.
 - The application Ref is DM/25/1218.
 - The development proposed is the erection of one pair of semi detached houses, with associated parking and new shared vehicular access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of one pair of semi detached houses, with associated parking and new shared vehicular access at 19 Estcots Drive, East Grinstead, West Sussex RH19 3DA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DM/25/1218, subject to the conditions in the attached Schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council states that the District Plan Review Examination hearings are due to be resumed. I have not been referred to any specific policies relevant to this appeal and no emerging policies were referred to in the reasons for refusal. In any case, there is no substantive evidence before me in respect of whether there are unresolved objections to the emerging policies and, as such, only minimal weight can be given to the policies within the emerging plan.
3. A signed Unilateral Undertaking dated 24 April 2026 has been submitted during the appeal process. This would secure a financial contribution to mitigate the effect of the development on the Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The Council considers the legal agreement addresses its third reason for refusal and has advised that the reason for refusal is no longer contested. The appeal will be determined on this basis, and I shall return to the legal agreement later in my decision.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the setting of the nearby listed buildings and the character or appearance of the Estcots Conservation Area (CA);
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area; and

- the effect of the proposed development on the integrity of the Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC.

Reasons

Heritage assets

5. The appeal site comprises part of the garden associated with the dwelling at No 19 Estcots Drive (No 19). Beyond the rear boundary of the site are the Grade II listed buildings at 'Estcots Farmhouse' and the 'Barn at Estcots Farm to east of House'. Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special regard be had to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their setting and any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.
6. Estcots Farmhouse dates from the 16th and early 17th centuries and comprises a large two-storey building finished with exposed timber and hanging tiles. The Farmhouse and Barn, together with Estcots Cottage, form part of a historic farmstead. The special interest of these buildings arises in part from their historical and architectural interest, which, despite alterations remain legible and illustrative of their original design. Significance and special interest are also partly derived from the buildings' historic function and their relationship with East Court mansion.
7. The buildings making up the former farmstead are accessed via a sunken lane to the rear of 20th century development at College Close. The former farmstead is primarily experienced from the sunken lane and is appreciated within a predominantly verdant rural context with limited views of the modern development to the rear. The rural character of the lane and the farmstead contrasts with the modern, built-up character of development at Estcots Drive to the rear of Estcots Farmhouse, including to either side of the appeal site.
8. The appeal site was previously associated with Estcots Farmhouse, and the parties suggest that it may have formed part of a larger walled garden. The site includes early-20th century garden features, including a stone cruciform pond and terrace. The small scale of development at the site allows for views towards the rear roof slopes of Estcots Farmhouse and the Barn. Given the historical association of the site with the listed buildings, it makes a positive contribution to their significance. However, the contribution is limited by the position of the site within a large, 20th century residential estate and its more recent association with No 19, which has considerably urbanised this part of the setting of the farmstead.
9. To the rear of the site, including the listed buildings and the area beyond is the CA, which is partly focussed on East Court mansion and its wider grounds. While the site is not within the CA, its proximity and the visibility of the land and buildings within the CA from Estcots Drive mean that the development would be within the setting of the CA.
10. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
11. The proposal is for a pair of semi-detached dwellings fronting Estcots Drive. The dwellings would result in the removal of the garden features and would erode the

existing open character of the site. In addition, the two-storey scale of the dwellings would reduce views through the site towards the CA and the rear roof slopes of Estcots Farmhouse and the Barn. While the dwellings would not be visible from the area to the front of the farmhouse due to the considerable changes in land levels, the dwellings would be viewed from the upper floor rear-facing windows of the farmhouse. However, visibility is not analogous to harm, and the proposal would primarily be seen within the context of the considerable existing modern development surrounding the site and the listed buildings, including development at Estcots Drive and College Close.

12. The development would encroach upon the setting of the heritage assets, in particular the listed buildings of Estcots Farmhouse and the Barn, primarily through the loss of views towards the farmstead from Estcots Drive. Nonetheless, the presence of modern development either side of the site would limit the harm that would arise from the partial loss of these views. Consequently, the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the heritage assets, albeit the level of harm would be at the lower end of the scale.
13. The impact in relation to the CA as a whole would be minor and given the extent of the CA and the limited scale of the proposal, would also be at the lower end of the less than substantial scale. That said, such harm to each of the designated heritage assets would not equate to less than substantial importance and weight; indeed, I attach considerable importance and weight to these harms. In accordance with Paragraph 215 of the Framework, the harm identified needs to be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme.
14. There is no dispute that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites that is required by the Framework. The proposal would provide two dwellings making a positive contribution to housing supply with associated social and economic benefits during the period of construction and once the dwellings are occupied. The Framework explains that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area and are often built-out relatively quickly. Cumulatively, these important benefits would outweigh the harm that would be caused to the significance of the listed buildings and the CA as designated heritage assets.
15. I conclude that the proposal would preserve the setting of the nearby listed buildings and the character and appearance of the CA. The development therefore accords with Policies DP34 and DP35 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2018 (MSDP) and Policy EG4 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan 2016 (NP), which, amongst other things, collectively require development to protect listed buildings and their settings and conserve or enhance the CA's special character, appearance and the range of activities which contribute to it. The proposal would also meet the expectations of the historic environment policies of the Framework, as set out above.

Character and appearance

16. The site comprises the side garden of No 19 and forms a gap in the built form on one side of Estcots Drive. Development in the area is typically set back from the road within defined rows and comprises predominantly two-storey dwellings. While the set back position of dwellings in the area creates a sense of spaciousness, the buildings are close together, limiting views through sites to the rear.

17. The proposal would consist of two-storey, semi-detached dwellings fronting Estcots Drive. The dwellings would be positioned broadly in line with development either side and the open frontage would emulate the predominantly open frontages of properties in the area. The development would partly fill the gap between No 19 and No 17 Estcots Drive (No 17) but would retain space either side and would allowing views through to the rear of the site.
18. The dwellings would have a stepped rise in ridge heights to reflect the increase in land levels from No 19 to No 17 Estcots Drive. While the dwellings would be large, the staggered ridge height and hipped roof would break up the overall mass and scale of the buildings. The central positioning of the dwellings with space retained to the sides would ensure that the proposal would not appear cramped or discordant with the prevailing pattern of development in the area.
19. The dwellings would be finished with red brick and horizontal boarding beneath a plain tile roof. Gables would project forward from the elevation fronting Estcots Drive and would have a central glazed section. The dwellings would differ from the design and material finish of existing development. However, forward projecting gables are prevalent on dwellings opposite the site, whilst the material finish such as the horizontal boarding is used in the locality. The boarding would also partly reflect the material finish of the farmstead buildings to the rear of the site.
20. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. The development therefore accords with Policy DP26 of the MSDP and Policy EG3 of the NP, which, amongst other things, collectively require development to be of a high quality design and layout and the form of the proposed development is proportionate and in keeping with the scale, height, materials and site coverage of the surrounding area.

Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC

21. Policy DP17 of the MSDP and Policy EG16 of the NP highlight that mitigation measures are necessary to counteract the effects of a potential increase in recreational pressure and are required for developments resulting in a net increase in dwellings within a 7km Zone of Influence (Zoi) of the Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC. The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 requires me as the decision maker to undertake an Appropriate Assessment where there are likely significant effects from the proposal, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, on the integrity of the sites.
22. It has been established that residential development within the Zoi would likely result in harm to the protected area through additional recreational disturbance. The proposal would create a net gain of dwellings and in combination with other developments permitted in the area there would be a likely significant effect on the integrity of the SPA and the SAC.
23. A Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) and Strategic Access Management and Monitoring (SAMM) mitigation approach has been developed and agreed with Natural England. These require the provision of a SANG, either on the development site itself or through a financial contribution to a strategic SANG elsewhere, and a separate financial contribution towards a SAMM strategy.
24. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on Appropriate Assessment indicates that any measures used to inform the decision about the effects on integrity need to be

sufficiently secured and likely to work in practice. The appellant has submitted a signed UU, under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 that would ensure a payment towards the mitigation strategy that is acceptable to the Council. Therefore, taking into consideration the submitted UU which would mitigate the proposed development, I conclude that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA and the SAC.

25. In this way harmful effects would be prevented. As a result, following an Appropriate Assessment, the proposal would not adversely affect the integrity of the SPA. There would therefore be no conflict with Policy DP17 of the MSDP and Policy EG16 of the NP, as set out above.

Other Matters

26. Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act) introduced a statutory framework for biodiversity net gain (BNG). Under the statutory framework, subject to some exceptions, every grant of planning permission is deemed to have been granted subject to the Biodiversity Gain Condition (BGC), which requires that at least a 10% increase in biodiversity value is met.
27. It is proposed that the BGC would be met primarily through off-site measures, including off-site credit units. The Council has not raised any concerns with this approach. If the 10% net gain could not be achieved onsite, the purchase of credits, or an agreement with a relevant off-site provider, would need to be secured through a planning obligation. Such an obligation could form part of the Biodiversity Gain Plan required by the deemed condition. Therefore, granting planning permission without a formal mechanism in place, to secure off-site gains or credits, would not affect the Council's ability to ensure that the BNG objective is achieved at a later stage.
28. The development would have windows within the side elevations serving the stairs in both dwellings. The windows would face towards the neighbouring dwellings, including No 17 and No 19. Nevertheless, given the position of the windows relative to the adjacent properties and the change in land levels, the windows would not result in harmful overlooking that would result in a loss of privacy for occupants of those dwellings.
29. Concerns have also been raised in respect of a loss of privacy for occupants of properties on the opposite side of Estcots Drive. The front elevations of properties opposite the site would be visible from the proposed dwellings. However, given that the separation distance and the open frontages of the existing properties, the development would not result in a harmful loss of privacy over and above the overlooking that could take place from the public realm.
30. Estcots Drive has parking restrictions, including double yellow lines. While the proposed development would increase vehicle movements, including during the construction period, the development would include onsite parking and would not be of a scale that would generate a significant increase in vehicle movements on the local highway network.
31. In front of the existing boundary fence is a 'Meridian marker', which appears to be within the appeal site. The status of the marker is unclear and there is no substantive evidence before me that demonstrates that the marker is a designated

heritage asset or a highway sign. Nonetheless, its position would appear to be to the side of the proposed entrance within a grassed area, and therefore it would be unaffected by the proposal.

32. A previous appeal was dismissed at the site. However, no details have been presented that details the nature of the proposal and I therefore cannot make a reasonable comparison with the scheme before me. In any event, each proposal should be considered on its individual merits and with appropriate regard to the development plan and any material considerations.

Planning Balance

33. There is no dispute that the Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites that is required by the Framework. Paragraph 11. d) i. of the Framework indicates that permission should be granted unless the application of policies in this Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed. Footnote 7 of the Framework details that this includes policies relating to designated heritage assets. However, given my finding in respect of the effect of the proposal on the designated heritage assets, this does not provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed.
34. Paragraph 11 d) ii. of the Framework indicates that permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.
35. The proposal would make a positive contribution to housing supply and delivery with associated social and economic benefits during the period of construction and once the dwellings are occupied. This is particularly the case given the Council's housing supply position. The Framework explains that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area and are often built-out relatively quickly. The addition of two dwellings through a more efficient use of land in an urban area and the associated benefits would make a small but important contribution to meeting housing need in the District.
36. Given the weight in favour of the proposal due to the delivery of housing, the adverse impacts would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies of the Framework taken as a whole.

Conditions

37. Suggested planning conditions have been provided by the Council. I have considered the conditions having regard to the Framework and advice contained in the PPG. I have adjusted the wording of some conditions to improve precision.
38. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed Condition 2 requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interests of certainty.
39. Conditions 3 and 4 are necessary to control surface water run-off to minimise the risk of flooding and to provide suitable means of foul water drainage. As Condition

3 would affect the early stages of construction, it needs to be discharged prior to the commencement of the development.

40. To provide suitable parking for future occupants and appropriate cycle storage facilities, Conditions 5 and 6 are reasonable and necessary. Condition 7 is necessary to safeguard ecology at the site.

Conclusion

41. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

John Pearce

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers 25 - J4738 - 01 – 001, 24 - J4738 - 01 – 002, 24 - J4738 - 01 – 003, 24 - J4738 - 02 – 001 and 24 - J4738 - 05 - 001.
- 3) The development hereby permitted shall not commence until details of the proposed foul and surface water drainage and means of disposal have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No building shall be occupied until all the approved drainage works have been carried out in accordance with the approved details. The details shall include a timetable for its implementation and a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development which shall include arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime. Maintenance and management during the lifetime of the development should be in accordance with the approved details.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall not connect any surface water drainage to public sewers (directly or indirectly) until confirmation of capacity existing within the network from the sewage provider has been submitted to and acknowledged in writing by the local planning authority.
- 5) No part of the development shall be first occupied until the car parking has been constructed in accordance with the approved site plan. These spaces shall thereafter be retained at all times for their designated purpose.
- 6) No part of the development shall be first occupied until covered and secure cycle parking spaces have been provided in accordance with plans and details to be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.
- 7) The development hereby permitted shall be undertaken in accordance with the Precautionary Working Methods Statement within section 6.18 of the submitted ecological report (Darwin Ecology, April 2025).

End of Schedule

Appeal 6002414

Appeal decision

Allowed

Decision issued on 17 June 2026.

[Appeal Decision 6002414.pdf](#)

Appeal type

Planning

Appeal procedure

Written

Appeal site

19 Estcots Drive, East Grinstead, RH19 3DA

Agent contact details

Bella Buffini

bbuffini@hghconsulting.com

+447714658385

Local planning authority

Mid Sussex

Application number

DM/25/1218

Our inspector will visit the site between 11:30am and 1:30pm on 11 May 2026. Someone must be at the site to give our inspector access.

Appeal details

[View appeal details](#)

Questionnaire

Questionnaire submitted on 20 Jan 2026

[View questionnaire](#)

Statements

Statement submitted on 16 Feb 2026

[View your statement](#)

Interested party comments

[View interested party comments](#)