

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/0737	Case Officer:	Susan Dubberley
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent		
Proposal:	Erection of new outbuilding, internal and external alterations to Grade II Listed Building. Change of use to allow C1 Use to upper floors.		
Site:	Castle Inn, London Road, Hickstead, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5LZ, ,		
Validation Date	24 Mar 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	29 Sep 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	8 Jan 2026
Target Date:	19 May 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Susan Dubberley</i>

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	268
--	--	-------------------------------	-----

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Steven King</i>	Date:	8 Jan 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/0737

**Castle Inn, London Road, Hickstead, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5LZ,
Erection of new outbuilding, internal and external alterations to Grade II Listed Building. Change
of use to allow C1 Use to upper floors.
Mrs Chloe Breen**

LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION

One letter of objection received:

- o The application has been submitted prior to planning consent being granted which is inappropriate for a listed property of this nature as it may compromise the heritage integrity of the building.
- o Similar applications have been rejected given the sensitive status of the castle in and the potential for irreversible harm the application should be refused in the interest of preserving our local heritage.

267 letters of support:

- o Local business people supporting and bringing back to life parts of local history.
- o Premises has been neglected / an eyesore for decades, great to see restored to former glory with a purpose / new business, vast improvement.
- o Without substantial investment would have deteriorated, lost landmark building.
- o Provides jobs for local community, great for economy, sound financial viability.
- o Will become a hub for local community and visitors.
- o Great to have some accommodation, somewhere to eat locally.
- o Good small scale accommodation is lacking in area.
- o Farm shop beneficial for locals and visitors.
- o A valued property for many in the equine / agricultural communities, a big part of the history and culture of area / huge part of the social scene.
- o Hickstead is a major attraction, proposal will add to value of area.
- o Great for users of A23.
- o Not competing with other businesses.
- o Preferable to a developer purchasing site and turning it into a block of flats.
- o Should be replaced.
- o Support new outbuildings around pub.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Conservation Officer:

Objection to creation of ensembles on first floor.

Twineham Parish Council

No objections to the application.

INTRODUCTION

Listed building consent is sought for the erection of new outbuilding, internal and external alterations to Grade II Listed Building and works to allow a change of use to C1 Use to the upper floors.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/25/0735 -.New crossover to South-West of site and addition of new acoustic fence to South-East boundary. Refused 19.03.2025.

DM/25/0736 - Erection of new outbuilding, internal and external alterations to Grade II Listed Building. Change of use to allow C1 Use to upper floors. Current application.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site comprises The Castle Inn, a Grade II listed pub and restaurant with a flat above, together with surrounding outbuildings and parking and garden curtilage. The listed building is part two storey part single storey and is located towards the eastern side of the site. The pub cellar occupies the basement of the building. To the north and west of the building is hardstanding providing informal parking, whilst to the south there is a garden area. The site is served by two vehicular access points situated along the eastern boundary of the site.

On inspection of the site some works had commenced including the clearance of the garden area with all vegetation including boundary hedges removed and a new lawn laid down.

To the north is a large field, to the east is the A2300 with the A23 beyond, to the south is Hickstead Lane and to the west is a row of dwellings the first of which is Lanzerac. On the western boundary there is a close boarded timber fence with a trellis on top.

The site is located within the countryside as defined by the development plan.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposal is for listed building consent for the erection of new outbuilding, internal and external alterations to Grade II Listed Building. The proposal also includes works to facilitate a change of use to allow C1 use to upper floors in order to use the first floor as bed and breakfast accommodation. The physical works are as follows:

External works to main building include:

Replacement of all U PVC doors and windows replaced with timber framed doors and windows, including the replacement of upvc windows at ground floor to the restaurant with timber frame French doors and existing upvc windows to the kitchen to be replaced with timber frame windows and the non-original external door to kitchen replaced.

At first floor bedroom windows that are in disrepair are to be replaced with timber sash windows to match the existing.

Heritage black aluminium rainwater goods are to replace non original PVC.

To the rear (north) roofslope of the 18th century wing, it is proposed to remove an existing flat roofed dormer and replace it with an extension of the adjacent catslide. It is also proposed to 'sandblast' the east elevation and repoint with lime mortar.

Solar panels are proposed to the flat roof of the 20th century extension to the rear (north facing) elevation.

Internal works to main building include:

Basement level:

Floor strengthening works

Ground floor:

Underfloor heating

corridor render and matt sealant:

Removal and replacement of kitchen ceiling

new staircase

First floor:

Ensuites to bedrooms

Underfloor heating:

replacement ceiling

Landscaping

The garden area would be laid to lawn with some tree planting proposed and a low brick wall on the boundary with a maximum height of 1.1m and shrub planting.

Change of use

On the 1st floor there is currently a seven-bed flat with 2 bathrooms. The proposed works would facilitate a change of use from a residential to a six-bedroom bed and breakfast accommodation and a managers studio flat. The ground floor would remain as a public house and restaurant with a cafe and farm shop proposed in the west wing of the building. The merits of the change of use will be considered in the planning application DM/25/0736.

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.

Specifically Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 states:

'In dealing with such an application the authority shall have regard to:

- a) The provisions of the development plan, so far as material to application,*
- b) Any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and*
- c) Any other material considerations.'*

Section 38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 provides:

'If regard is to be had to the development plan for the purposes of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.'

The requirement to determine applications "in accordance with the plan" does not mean applications must comply with each and every policy, but is to be approached on the basis of the plan taken as a whole. This reflects the fact, acknowledged by the Courts, that development plans can have broad statements of policy, many of which may be mutually irreconcilable so that in a particular case one must give way to another.

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.

Using this as the starting point the development plan for this part of Mid Sussex consists of the District Plan, Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) and Twineham 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:

DP34 - Listed buildings and other Heritage Assets

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.

Twineham Neighbourhood Plan

The Twineham Neighbourhood Plan was made on 24 March 2016.

Relevant policies:

There are no relevant policies.

Other Legislation

Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990

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:

DPB2: Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets

Mid Sussex Design Guide 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)

National Planning Policy Guidance

ASSESSMENT

The application site comprises The Castle Inn, a Grade II listed pub and restaurant with a flat above, together with surrounding outbuildings and parking and garden curtilage. The listed building is part two storey part single storey and is located towards the eastern side of the site.

Section 16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 outlines the statutory duty placed on Local Planning Authorities to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a [listed] building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses.

Policy DP34 of the MSDP states:

'Development will be required to protect listed buildings and their settings. This will be achieved by ensuring that:

- A thorough understanding of the significance of the listed building and its setting has been demonstrated. This will be proportionate to the importance of the building and potential impact of the proposal;*
- Alterations or extensions to a listed building respect its historic form, scale, setting, significance and fabric. Proposals for the conversion or change of use of a listed building retain its significance and character whilst ensuring that the building remains in a viable use;*
- Traditional building materials and construction techniques are normally used. The installation of uPVC windows and doors will not be acceptable;*
- Satellite antennae, solar panels or other renewable energy installations are not sited in a prominent location, and where possible within the curtilage rather than on the building itself;*
- Special regard is given to protecting the setting of a listed building;*

- Where the historic fabric of a building may be affected by alterations or other proposals, the applicant is expected to fund the recording or exploratory opening up of historic fabric.'

The following paragraphs of the NPPF are also relevant:

'210. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and*
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.*

212. 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 (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

213. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- (a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;*
- (b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional*

214. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and*
- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and*
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.*

215. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'

The Council's Conservation Officer has reviewed the application and initially commented:

'The application site, the Castle Inn, is a Grade II listed building, dating originally from the 18th century, with attached early 19th century parallel ranges, and later additions. The 18th century core of the building faces onto Hickstead Lane, whereas the larger 19th century ranges are set perpendicular to this fronting onto London Road. To the rear (west) is an attached 18th century stables building which appears to be part of an originally significantly larger group of attached and unattached buildings which formed a courtyard to the rear of the building. A further 18th century outbuilding positioned in the angle of the original and 19th century ranges has also become attached to these ranges by 19th and 20th century extensions. Historical map regression suggests that the group of buildings was during the 19th century the farmstead of Hickstead Farm, and only became a hotel during the late 19th or early 20th century. It was renamed the Castle Hotel, taking the name from the previously existing Castle Inn, which was located just to the south of the adjacent road junction (now known as The Old Post Office).

Based on the information in front of us I would consider that the listed building possesses architectural value based on its design, construction and craftsmanship, historical illustrative value particularly relating to the evolution of its use over time from farm to hotel and public house, and aesthetic value, based in part on the use of vernacular materials within the older parts of the building. As a c.1900 public house it will also have some communal value as a longstanding focus of the local community.'

It was noted that works had started on site and further information was requested including justification for the removal of render and repointing with lime water on the east elevation and further justification and structure calculations for works to the basement and details of under floor heating to the ground floor.

'In summary, there are significant aspects of the existing and the further proposed works to the Castle Inn which require further information and/or revision. There are areas which are of concern in terms of impact on the special interest of the listed building, including in particular the extensive strengthening/structural works, the alterations to the plan form at first floor, and the sandblasting of the eastern façade. The extensive stripping out works which have taken place without consent, and the potential loss of historic fabric involved with these, are highly regrettable, and the appropriate reinstatement of the fabric and spaces affected should form part of the current applications- in many cases, insufficient information has been provided in this respect.'

The external works were generally considered acceptable subject to details conditions:

'The proposed new outbuildings to the west of the existing are not considered contentious, although further detail of roofing and facing materials and of external doors and windows would be sought by condition on any approval granted.'

Solar panels are proposed to the flat roof of the 20th century extension to the rear (north facing) elevation. These should be shown on appropriate sectional drawings- it appears likely that they may be hidden from view from ground level by surrounding roof structures, but sectional drawings would be required to confirm this.

Proposed landscaping:

The proposed landscaping plan is generally acceptable, however there are a couple of points requiring reconsideration or further information:

- *The proposed refuse store is shown in a rather isolated and exposed position to the northern side of the car park, which is likely to render it unduly visually prominent. This side of the parking area would benefit from further planting of e.g. native hedgerow species and I would suggest that some reconsideration of the treatment of this area should include provision of appropriate planted screening around the store.'*

Following the submission of amended plans which removed two of the ensembles from within bedrooms and the submission of the further information and details requested the Conservation Office has now commented:

'In general, this information is acceptable. With respect to the works to the elevations of the building as set out in the plans received on 25th November and the previously received method statement from the contractor, I have some concerns regarding the condition of the brickwork- it is suggested that this had been previously shotblasted, but it is difficult since the recent works have been completed in advance of consent being granted to assess whether the removal of paint using chemical peels and sand blasting may have exacerbated this damage. On balance, given the lack of evidence either way, it is considered that an objection to this aspect of the scheme would be difficult to sustain.

With respect to the further repair work including repointing which is now proposed, I note the suggested use of a 1:3 lime putty:aggregate mortar, rather than the hydraulic lime mix which was included with the previous details provided by Medland. This amendment is welcomed, however we would need some clarity regarding the detail of the pointing style, which is variously described as flush, weathered and bucket handle. Given the condition of the brickwork including the arisses of the bricks, a flat recessed joint may be more appropriate- weatherstruck, which appears to be shown in the photograph on the most recent plan, will in particular not be appropriate to this context. If the application moves towards approval, a condition requiring further detail including a sample panel should be imposed. Details of the mix to the proposed render repairs should also be required.

In summary, the majority of the proposal is now considered on balance acceptable. I remain concerned regarding the introduction of ensembles at first floor, and there are some areas where further information would be required by condition were an approval to be granted.

The proposals result in a low level of less than substantial harm due to the adverse impact of the changes in plan form at first floor. This harm may however be considered to be balanced by the works of restoration elsewhere to the building, by the establishment of an ongoing use for the Inn, and potentially by other public benefits, if these are present, under the terms of paragraph 215 of the NPPF.'

The conservation officer's concerns still remain regarding the internal partitioning proposed to create the ensuite bathrooms, on the basis that these alterations are detrimental to the plan form at first floor, as it is considered by the Conservation Officer that this will adversely impact the historic proportions of the rooms concerned. The harm identified by the Conservation Officer is at a low level of less than substantial harm. It is noted there are no objections raised regarding the remainder of the internal and external works, subject to conditions requiring further details.

In this case, it is considered that the partitioning required to install the ensembles has to be weighed up against the wider benefits of the works of restoration to the listed building that are proposed and by the establishment of an ongoing use for the Inn. With this in mind, considering the benefits of the restoration, long term upkeep and maintenance of the listed building and it is considered by your Planning Officer that overall, the proposal would preserve the special interest of the Listed Building and its setting and would therefore meet the aims of Policy DP34 of the District Plan and the requirements of the NPPF.

Given the above, the proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy DP34 and the aims of the NPPF.

CONCLUSION

Planning legislation requires the application to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It is therefore necessary for the planning application to be assessed against the policies in the Development Plan and then to take account of other material planning considerations including the NPPF. The Development Plan in this instance consists of the Mid Sussex District Plan, the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and the Twineham Neighbourhood Plan.

The proposed works are overall considered to be of a design and scale sensitive to the character of the listed building and its setting and would preserve the listed building. The building has suffered from neglect over the years and the application offers an opportunity for improvements and refurbishment works that will preserve the future of this listed building. In view of this it is considered that overall, the proposal would preserve the special interest of the Listed Building and its setting and thereby meet the aims of Policy DP34 of the District Plan as well as the requirements of both the NPPF and the Listed Building and Conservation Area (LBCA) Act 1990.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Susan Dubberley