



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, FSLCC

Email: townclerk@eastgrinstead.gov.uk

To: Members of the Planning Committee
Quorum is 3.

18th November 2025

Dear Councillor

Your attendance is required at a meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** to be held in the **COUNCIL CHAMBER, EAST COURT** on **TUESDAY 25th NOVEMBER 2025** at **7pm**. Where possible please clarify any points or raise questions before the meeting with the Clerk or Chairman to ensure an answer can be given. If you are not able to attend and wish to send a substitute, please advise the Clerk who this will be.

Non-committee members wishing to attend and speak must ensure that they seek permission from the Chairman before the meeting starts and should indicate the item they wish to speak on.

Yours faithfully

Samantha Heynes
Town Clerk

ORDER OF MEETING

7pm Public Participation

Members of the public may attend the meeting in person or remotely. There is a period of up to 15 minutes for public questions relating to items on the agenda.

Any question must be submitted to the Town Clerk 24 hours in advance of the meeting, referencing the agenda item it is related to.

Representations will be restricted to a maximum of 2 persons speaking for and/or against the application. In the event of a large number of speakers, the Chairman has the discretion to increase the number allowed to speak.

Each member of public will be able to speak for a maximum of 2 minutes and will have no right of reply. If a question cannot be answered at the meeting, a written response may be provided at a later date.

The Chairman's interpretation of the standing orders is final. Should there be no questions, or the questions complete before the end of 15 minutes the Chairman will move along to the agenda and public participation will end.

To request the meeting link please contact townclerk@eastgrinstead.gov.uk no later than noon on the day of the meeting.

AGENDA

The Planning Committee will commence immediately upon completion of public participation.

- 72. To receive apologies for absence/substitutions
- 73. To receive the minutes of the meeting held on 4th November 2025
- 74. To receive Members' Declarations of Interest
- 75. Chairman's Announcements
The Chairman will update the committee on any matters that have arisen
- 76. To note the Planning Action List – no outstanding actions
- 77. To note the Appeal Decisions on applications DM/24/0553 and DM/25/1084 (Appendix A)
- 78. Licensing Applications

The Committee are asked to make any comments as deemed appropriate regarding the below to pass to Mid Sussex DC. The full application can be seen on the planning portal under licensing.

LI/25/1647	RFC Chicken & Ribs 22 Railway Approach East Grinstead RH19 1BP	New premises licence
------------	---	----------------------

- 79. To make observations as may be considered necessary in respect of the planning applications (Appendix B)
- 80. To note any planning and/or appeal decisions received from Mid Sussex District Council attached (Appendix C)

The next meeting of the Planning Committee will be held on **Tuesday 16th December 2025 at 7pm**



Planning Inspectorate

Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Direct Line: 45728
Customer Services:
0303 444 5000

Email: EAST3@PLANNINGINSPECTORATE.GOV.UK
www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate

Your Ref: DM/24/0553

Our Ref: APP/D3830/W/25/3368572

FAO Service Support
Mid Sussex District Council
Planning Department
Oaklands
Oaklands Rd
Haywards Heath
W Sussex
RH16 1SS

07 November 2025

Dear Sir/Madam,

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Appeal by Mr Jeremy Miles

Site Address: The Croft, Holttye Road, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 3QF

Outcome

I enclose a copy of our Inspector's decision on the above appeal(s).

Thank you for your cooperation and patience while we reviewed your case and all relevant documentation.

What Next?

Please note that the Planning Inspectorate cannot change or revoke the outcome of the attached decision as only the High Court can quash this decision. The Planning Inspectorate is not the administrative body for High Court challenges. If you would like more information on the strictly enforced deadline for challenging a decision or a copy of the form for lodging a challenge, please get in touch with the administrative court on 02079476655.

Support

If you have any questions about how we handled the appeal(s), please use our [customer contact form](https://contact-us.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/hc/en-gb/requests/new) / <https://contact-us.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/hc/en-gb/requests/new> , or call us on 0303 444 5000. Our customer service phone line is open between 09:00 and 16:00, Monday through Friday (closed on weekends and public holidays).

If you do not have Internet access, please write to the customer quality team at the address above.

Feedback

We are committed to improving the quality of our service and experience for our customers.

Please take a few minutes to give your feedback via the short survey. As stated in our customer charter, we will learn from our mistakes and work to improve how we do things.

[Your feedback makes us better](https://forms.office.com/e/nLDD4REWgf) / <https://forms.office.com/e/nLDD4REWgf>

Thank you in advance for taking the time to provide us with valuable feedback.

Yours sincerely,

Sara Burke

Sara Burke

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-inspectorate-privacy-notice>

Where applicable, you can use the internet to submit documents, to see information and to check the progress of cases through GOV.UK. The address of the search page is - <https://www.gov.uk/appeal-planning-inspectorate>



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2025

by **C Housden BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 NOVEMBER 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/W/25/3368572

The Croft, Holtye Road, East Grinstead, West Sussex RH19 3QF

- 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 Jeremy Miles against the decision of Mid Sussex District Council.
 - The application ref is DM/24/0553.
 - The development proposed is removal of existing garage and erection of self-build detached house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect on the character and appearance of the area, including whether the development would conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the High Weald National Landscape (HWNL) and whether the proposal would preserve the setting of the Grade II listed building Fairlight Farmhouse;
 - the location of the development situated outside of a defined settlement boundary; and
 - the accessibility to services and facilities for future occupiers of the development;

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is situated within the HWNL. Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act (2000), as amended by section 245 of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act (2023), requires relevant authorities to seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of National Landscapes.
4. The HWNL Management Plan (2024) describes that the natural beauty of the HWNL is derived from an essentially rural and small-scale landscape character which is rich in wildlife and cultural features. The core components of this natural beauty include the notion of a quintessential English pastoral landscape comprising small, irregular and productive fields, bound by hedgerows and woods, typically used for livestock grazing and a land-based economy. The landscape is influenced by rural living which has visibly and culturally shaped it.

5. The appeal site forms part of the curtilage of The Croft and contains a detached garage which appears subservient to the host property. The appeal site positively contributes to the natural beauty of the area by providing a sense of rural living through forming part of an informal and spacious cluster of detached dwellings and agricultural buildings set within the rural landscape of rolling fields bound by hedgerows and mature trees.
6. The appeal site is also situated within the setting of Fairlight Farmhouse, a Grade II listed building. In accordance with the statutory duty set out in Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving its setting.
7. The evidence shows the significance of Fairlight Farmhouse lies in its architectural and historical merits as an example of a sixteenth-century Sussex farmhouse. Whilst there appears to be some modern additions to the building and wider plot, the assets appearance, with timber beams, white render and orange roof tiles is distinctive and allows the historical and architectural merits of the property as a historic farmhouse to be readily perceptible.
8. Whilst the host property, The Croft, and intervening vegetation separates the appeal site from Fairlight Farmhouse, it is nevertheless situated within close proximity, and forms part of the surroundings in which the asset is experienced. In particular, the appeal site forms part of a low-density cluster of rural development, which positively contributes to the open rural surroundings of how the asset is experienced as a historic farmhouse. This contribution of the appeal site to the setting is particularly prevalent on the approach to Fairlight Farmhouse. Whilst the appeal site contains a detached garage, it is not so intrusive to undermine this open and low-density appearance. As such, the appeal site positively contributes to the setting of the listed building.
9. The proposed development would subdivide the plot and replace the existing garage with a large two storey dwelling which includes a modern asymmetric double gable design, a slate roof and extensive glazing. The proposed design, including roof materials and glazing, would fail to take cues from the surrounding rural development. Instead, the modern urban design and significant bulk, scale and mass of the development would be distinctly out of keeping with the character and appearance of the informal low-density cluster of rural development and would appear highly prominent and intrusive within the area. Furthermore, the rigid subdivision of the plot and formation of formalised frontage parking for both the host dwelling and proposed dwelling would undermine the informal rural appearance of the plot and wider area.
10. The proposed development would therefore cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the HWNL.
11. For the reasons given above, the proposal would also detract from the rural surroundings in which Fairlight Farmhouse is experienced and therefore would not preserve the setting of the heritage asset. In the context of paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the level of harm identified would be less than substantial and would lie within the middle of the spectrum due to the overall scale of the proposal.

12. Paragraph 212 of the Framework states 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. Paragraph 215 of the Framework requires less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
13. Whilst I have not been provided with an exact figure, the evidence before me confirms that the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. It is the Government's objective to significantly boost the supply of housing, including through small and medium schemes and the proposal would contribute an additional dwelling to the Council's housing land supply. Furthermore, the evidence shows that there are currently 28 individuals on the Mid Sussex self and custom build register, including the appellant, and this proposal would help to meet this demand by providing a self-build dwelling. The proposal would also lead to a small and time limited economic benefit during the construction phase, as well as some limited social and economic benefits resulting from future occupiers. The development would also utilise technologies to reduce the future occupiers carbon footprint. Given the small scale of the development, these public benefits would only carry limited weight in favour of the proposal which is insufficient to outweigh the harm to the setting of the designated heritage asset which to which I attach considerable importance and weight.
14. The proposal therefore would conflict with Policies DP12, DP16, DP26 and DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan (2018) (MSDP) and Policies EG1 and EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan (2016) (EGNP). These policies, amongst other matters, seek to protect listed buildings and their settings, whilst ensuring that development is of a high-quality design that conserves and enhances the natural beauty of the HWNL.

Location of development

15. The evidence shows that the appeal site is situated outside of a defined settlement boundary and within the countryside. Policy DP12 describes that development outside of the built-up area boundaries will be permitted provided it maintains or where possible enhances the quality of the rural and landscape character of the District and is supported by a specific policy elsewhere in the development plan.
16. Policy DP15 of the MSDP sets out that new homes in the countryside are supported provided special justification exists and that there is no conflict with Policy DP12 of the MSDP.
17. The appellant sets out that the special justification for the proposal relates to the delivery of a self-build home which the Council are required to provide and is not limited to providing these types of homes on sites within settlement boundaries. However, in the context of Policy DP15 it is clear that special justification is limited to the closed list contained within the policy itself. The provision of a self-build dwelling would not amount to special justification in the context of Policy DP15 and the development would not meet any of the other criteria contained within the list. Furthermore, the proposal would not maintain the quality of the rural and landscape character of the district and would conflict with Policy DP12 for the reasons previously given.
18. The location of the development being situated outside of a defined settlement boundary would therefore conflict with Policies DP12 and DP15 of the MSDP

which sets out the plan-led approach to dealing with development outside of the defined settlement boundaries.

Accessibility to services and facilities

19. The evidence before me suggests that the nearest settlement, East Grinstead, is situated within 2km of the appeal site. Furthermore, a bus stop situated along Holtye Road would be within 1km of the appeal site. However, to access both the services and facilities within East Grinstead and the bus stop situated on Holtye Road, future occupiers would be required to travel along unlit public rights of way. This makes accessing these services and facilities impractical and undesirable for future residents, particularly in the evenings and nighttime or within the winter when the hours of daylight are fewer. For this reason, it is very unlikely that future occupiers would use a mode of transport other than a private motor car to meet their daily needs.
20. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policy DP21 of the MSDP. This policy, amongst other matters, seeks to ensure that development is sustainably located to minimise the need for travel.

Other Matters

21. The evidence shows that the appeal site is situated within the 7km zone of influence of the Ashdown Forest Special Area of Conservation and Special Protection Area.
22. A unilateral undertaking has accompanied the appeal which secures financial contributions towards the Ashdown Forest Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Strategy and the Sustainable Alternative Natural Green Space Strategy. The Council has confirmed in its evidence that the unilateral undertaking would secure sufficient mitigation to address the second reason for refusal.
23. However, as I am dismissing the appeal on other grounds it is not necessary to consider this matter further and carry out an appropriate assessment, as doing so would not lead me to a different conclusion on the outcome of the appeal.

Planning Balance

24. As mentioned above, the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply meaning the provisions of paragraph 11d) of the Framework are engaged. Footnote 8 confirms in these circumstances the policies which are most important for determining the application are deemed to be out-of-date. Owing to the age of the EGNP the provisions of paragraph 14 of the Framework would not be engaged.
25. Paragraph 232 of the Framework confirms due weight should be given to policies, according to their consistency with the Framework.
26. Conflict with Policies DP12, DP16 and DP26 of the MSDP and Policies EG1 and EG3 of the EGNP in relation to the effect on the character and appearance of the area, including the effect on the HWNL is given significant weight against the proposal. This is due to their consistency with the Framework, namely paragraphs 135 and 139 which seeks to ensure development adds to the overall quality of the area and sets out that development, which is not well designed should be refused,

and paragraph 189 which provides great weight to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Landscapes.

27. Conflict with Policy DP34 of the MSDP also carries significant weight owing to its consistency with the Framework, namely paragraph 212 which attributes great weight to the conservation of designated heritage assets.
28. The Council is not meeting the local housing needs of the area through its development plan. It is therefore failing to meet paragraph 61 of the Framework which sets out the Government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes and ensuring sufficient amount of land can come forward. As such, conflict with Policies DP12, DP15 and DP21 of the MSDP in so far as they relate to the restriction of the creation of new dwellings owing to the location of the development and access to services and facilities would carry moderate weight against the proposal.
29. The development would result in a conflict with the development plan as a whole and the abovementioned paragraphs of the Framework.
30. Paragraph 11d) of the Framework indicates that planning permission should be granted unless, the application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reason for refusing the development proposed. Footnote 7 confirms that this includes policies relating to both designated heritage assets and National Landscapes.
31. As such, the abovementioned policies of the Framework relating to heritage assets and National Landscapes provide a strong reason for refusing the development proposed. The presumption in favour of sustainable development would therefore not apply.
32. The other material considerations, which I have previously identified in my public benefits balance, carry limited weight in favour of the proposed development for the reasons that I have given and would not outweigh the harms that I have identified.

Conclusion

33. 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, I conclude for the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

C Housden

INSPECTOR



Planning Inspectorate

Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Direct Line:
Customer Services:
0303 444 5000

Email: PADSplanning@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate

Your Ref: DM/25/1084
Our Ref: APP/D3830/D/25/3373104

FAO Service Support
Mid Sussex District Council
Planning Department
Oaklands
Oaklands Rd
Haywards Heath
W Sussex
RH16 1SS

11 November 2025

Dear Sir/Madam,

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Appeal by Mr and Mrs Stephen and Jaqueline Upton
Site Address: Hurley Farm, Turners Hill Road, EAST GRINSTEAD, RH19 4LB

Outcome

I enclose a copy of our Inspector's decision on the above appeal(s).

Thank you for your cooperation and patience while we reviewed your case and all relevant documentation.

What Next?

Please note that the Planning Inspectorate cannot change or revoke the outcome of the attached decision as only the High Court can quash this decision. The Planning Inspectorate is not the administrative body for High Court challenges. If you would like more information on the strictly enforced deadline for challenging a decision or a copy of the form for lodging a challenge, please get in touch with the administrative court on 02079476655.

Support

If you have any questions about how we handled the appeal(s), please use our [customer contact form](https://contact-us.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/hc/en-gb/requests/new) / <https://contact-us.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/hc/en-gb/requests/new>, or call us on 0303 444 5000. Our customer service phone line is open between 09:00 and 16:00, Monday through Friday (closed on weekends and public holidays).

If you do not have Internet access, please write to the customer quality team at the address above.

Feedback

We are committed to improving the quality of our service and experience for our customers.

Please take a few minutes to give your feedback via the short survey. As stated in our customer charter, we will learn from our mistakes and work to improve how we do things.

[Your feedback makes us better](https://forms.office.com/e/nLDD4REWgf) / <https://forms.office.com/e/nLDD4REWgf>

Thank you in advance for taking the time to provide us with valuable feedback.

Yours sincerely,

Erin Lindell

Erin Lindell

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-inspectorate-privacy-notice>

Where applicable, you can use the internet to submit documents, to see information and to check the progress of cases through GOV.UK. The address of the search page is - <https://www.gov.uk/appeal-planning-inspectorate>



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

Planning Application No	Ward	Location	Proposal
DM/25/0823/FUL	Town South	Sackville College High Street East Grinstead West Sussex	Repairs to historic boundary wall
DM/25/1205/FUL	Town North	Mount Noddy Cemetery Blackwell Road East Grinstead West Sussex	Proposal to erect six above ground columbariums for ashes interments and install a path in front of the columbarium. (revised plans received 16.09.2025)
DM/25/2530/FUL	Ashplats North	Orchard Nursery Holtye Road East Grinstead West Sussex	Construction of 2 new single span polytunnels,
DM/25/2648/FUL	Baldwins	36 And 38 Buckhurst Way East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 2AJ	Proposal to erect six above ground columbariums for ashes interments and install a path in front of the columbarium. (revised plans received 28.10.2025)
DM/25/2707/FUL	Herontye & Ashplats South	42 Cavalier Way East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 4SE	Retrospective application for the Change of Use of existing outbuilding to beauty treatment room (Use Class E (e)).
DM/25/2731/FUL	Town South	Sainsbury's Brooklands Way East Grinstead West Sussex	Removal of a canopy and replacement with new shroud and related works
DM/25/2736/LDC	Town South	26 Estcots Drive East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 3DA	Proposed garage conversion
DM/25/2761/HOU	Town South	Lismore West Lane East Grinstead West Sussex	Proposed roof extension to create additional 2no bedrooms including 2no dormers to the front and 8no velux roof lights.
DM/25/2780/LDC	Imberhome	The Spinney Chapmans Lane East Grinstead West Sussex	Conversion of existing garage to living room and creation of new ground floor left flank window .
DM/25/2820/HOU	Herontye & Ashplats South	5 Kings Copse East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 4TH	Proposed single storey side extension to replace conservatory
DM/25/2828/PMC	Town South	Crown Lodge Cantelupe Road East Grinstead West Sussex	Conversion of offices to two flats.
DM/25/2833/FUL	Herontye & Ashplats South	Hampton House High Street East Grinstead West Sussex	Change of use of building from Class E to residential to form 4no flats.
DM/25/2843/LDC	Imberhome	23 Bluebell Close East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 1RS	Garage conversion
DM/25/2848/TREE	Imberhome	6 Campbell Crescent East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 1JR	Sycamore - Fell
DM/25/2849/LBC	Herontye & Ashplats South	Hampton House High Street East Grinstead West Sussex	Change of use of building from Class E to residential to form 4no flats
DM/25/2922/TREE	Ashplats North	18 Brook Close East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 3XZ	Twin Stem Oak (T1) - Reduce by 2-3 metres to previous points and remove epicormic growth on stem.
DM/25/2924/TREE	Ashplats North	Queen Victoria Hospital Holtye Road East Grinstead West Sussex	T1 - Oak - reduce back branches from house at No 5 Holtye Ave by 2.5 metres.

Planning Application No	Ward	Location	Proposal	EGTC Comments	MSDC Decision
DM/24/2704/FUL	Ashplats North	Land At Queen Victoria Hospital Hackenden Lane East Grinstead West Sussex	Erection of 36 dwellings with access from Oakfield Way along with parking and landscaping. (Further information and plans submitted 3/12, 22/1, 20/2 and 25/2 in regard to affordable housing, trees, ecology and drainage)	No comment, however the Planning Committee have requested a site meeting with MSDC Officers to discuss concerns and will submit comments following this meeting.	Approved 18/11/2025
DM/25/1928/FUL	Imberhorne	Woodcote Yew Lane East Grinstead West Sussex	Erection of new self build dwelling alterations to side elevation of existing house to amend the fenestration	Committee recommended refusal of this application on the basis of DP26 Character & Design: to protect valued characteristics of the built environment for their historical and visual qualities, & EG3 Promoting Good Design b, c and d. In summary it was felt that the proposed development would be too large for the plot, have a negative impact on the neighbours and would represent an overdevelopment of the site creating a discordant feature within the area.	Refused 14/11/2025
DM/25/2249/HOU	Town South	17 Southlands East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 4DB	Proposed first floor extension above ground floor	No comment	Approved 14/11/2025
DM/25/2263/TREE	Town North	32 Sister Ann Way East Grinstead West Sussex RH19 3BQ	(T1) Scots Pine - Fell	The committee supported approval subject to no adverse report from the MSDC tree officer.	Approved 29/10/2025
DM/25/2419/HOU	Herontye & Ashplats South	Link Cottage Ship Street East Grinstead West Sussex	Proposed front extension to accommodate garage and turntable and alterations to roof over.	No comment	Approved 17/11/2025