

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/0796	Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent		
Proposal:	Internal and External Alterations Including Replacement of Windows and Widened Parking Area		
Site:	Whitehouse Farm Cottage, Staplefield Lane, Staplefield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 6AU, ,		
Validation Date	28 Mar 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	6 Jun 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	27 Jun 2025
Target Date:	23 May 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Stefan Galyas</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	27 Jun 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/0796

**Whitehouse Farm Cottage, Staplefield Lane, Staplefield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 6AU,
Internal and External Alterations Including Replacement of Windows and Widened Parking Area
Mr Julian Date**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

There were no letters of representation received in response to the proposed development.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Conservation Officer: *'In summary, the proposal is considered to preserve the special interest of the listed building, meeting the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF'*

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Parish Council: No comment received.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks listed building consent for the replacement of the existing properties windows, two rear dormers, the erection of a brick retaining wall, to extend the parking area, the removal of sections of internal walls, the replacement of the staircase, changes to floor levels within the rear extension and the creation of an ensuite.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/25/0795 - Internal and external alterations including replacement of windows and widened parking area. Pending consideration.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application relates to Whitehouse Farm Cottage, a grade II listed building set to the eastern side of the highway. The cottage appears to have been constructed during the 18th century as a single dwelling but later subdivided into separate dwellings. There are two ranges to the property, including a front brick-built range with a tiled roof and a rear stone ashlar range. The existing property is listed under the following description:

'C 18. Two storeys. Three windows. Red brick and grey headers. Horsham slab roof. Casement windows.'

The site is not set within any designated settlement boundary and there are other grade II listed buildings nearby such as Whitehouse Cottage to the northeast which formed a loose grouping with the application site and Whitehouse Farm to the south. The site is also set within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposal would develop two rear dormers within the existing cat slide style roof slope which would utilise a hipped design. The dormers would measure at approximately 2m in length, 1.6m wide and 1.6m

in maximum height. The proposed dormers would be constructed of tile hanging to the cheeks, traditional handmade clay roof tiles and mortar bedded bonnet hip tiles and flush casement windows.

Throughout the existing dwelling, the existing windows would be replaced with painted casement units. New lead flashing would be added as well as the recladding of the existing clay tiles with lichen and moss to be removed. There would be new cast iron gutter and downpipes added. The existing driveway area would be extended in footprint out to the side of the dwelling. A new rear brick retaining wall would also be constructed as part of the development proposal.

Internally, the existing staircase within the rear extension would be replaced with a newly configured staircase and associated studwork partition works. In association with the new staircase, there would be alterations to the existing floor levels within the rear extension and a new ensuite would also be created as part of the works.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND LIST OF POLICIES

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

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

DP26: Character and Design

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.

Neighbourhood Plan

Ansty, Staplefield and Brook Street Neighbourhood Plan 2015-2031 (Made February 2017)

Relevant Policies:

None relevant.

Other Legislation

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 16(2) - In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the Local Planning Authority or the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

Other Material Considerations

Mid Sussex District Plan 2021-2039 Consultation Draft

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) was published for public consultation on 12th January 2024 for six weeks and as a result of this consultation there are unresolved objections to some of the Policies in the draft District Plan. 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:

DPS1 - Climate Change

DPS2 - Sustainable Design and Construction

DPB1 - Character and Design

DPB2 - Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets

Mid Sussex Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

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

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 is a material consideration. Paragraphs 2, 8, 11, 39, 48, 131, 135, 139, 207, 208, 209, 212-215, 219 & 220.

ASSESSMENT

It is considered that the main issues that need to be considered in the determination of this application are as follows;

- Impact on Heritage Assets and Character and Design

Impact on Heritage Assets and Character and Design

With regard to the setting of the listed building, DP34 requires:

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

o 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;

o 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;

o Traditional building materials and construction techniques are normally used. The installation of uPVC windows and doors will not be acceptable;

o 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;

o Special regard is given to protecting the setting of a listed building;

o 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.'

Paragraph 207 of the NPPF requires the applicant to describe the significance of any heritage asset affected. Significance is defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF as *"The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting."* The applicant has provided a Heritage Statement in support of the application which assesses the proposals impact on the relevant heritage assets. Therefore, this requirement of the NPPF is considered to have been met.

Paragraph 208 of the NPPF requires the Local Planning Authority to identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected and take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal.

The listed building is considered to be significant in heritage terms by virtue of its designation and this significance is likely to arise from its architectural value, historic value and group value.

The NPPF 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.

Paragraphs 212 - 215 of the NPPF states:

'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.

DP26 of the District Plan states, in part:

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

- o is of high quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace;*

- o *contributes positively to, and clearly defines, public and private realms and should normally be designed with active building frontages facing streets and public open spaces to animate and provide natural surveillance;*
- o *creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape;*
- o *protects open spaces, trees and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;*
- o *does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings, including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight, and noise, air and light pollution'*

Principle DG49 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide states:

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

With regard to loft conversions and roof extensions, Principle DG52 notes that:

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

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

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

The below assessment is made whilst being mindful of this guidance and having regard to the statutory duty of the Council, as the Local Planning Authority, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting in accordance with the requirements of Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

It is considered that the existing building subject to the application is positioned within a rural setting with sporadically placed dwellings positioned along Staplefield Lane. The application site is set slightly back from the highway edge by both a private driveway and pedestrian stepped access. The dwelling is considered to be afforded modest yet verdant grounds to both the front and rear.

The proposal would extend the existing dwelling at first floor level through the addition of two rear elevation hipped dormers. These would sit within the existing rear catslide roof with the existing brick built chimney stack in between. Following a consultation with the Conservation Officer, it was noted that the addition of dormers within a catslide roof had the potential to be viewed as contentious. However, in this instance, there is a steepening in the roof slope between the original dwelling and the later rear outshot extension. As such, it was considered that the modest appearance of the dormers would not cause significant harm towards the appearance and special interest of the building.

The existing steel casement windows throughout the dwelling would be replaced with single glazed timber casement windows. The existing windows date from the 20th century and were noted by the Conservation Officer as possessing little historic interest. As such, these alterations are deemed to be acceptable in this instance.

To the side (north-west) of the existing property, the existing driveway would be extended in footprint which would remove some of the existing rear garden amenity space and erect a new brick retaining wall to act as the boundary between these spaces. Such alterations were not considered to detract from the relation between the application site and the grade II listed Whitehouse Cottage to the north-east.

Furthermore, it is considered that the driveway extension and the introduction of a low level retaining wall would not have a significantly adverse impact towards the character of the listed cottage.

With regard to the proposal external materials, further details prior to the commencement of the development including facing roofing materials, bricks to be used for the retaining wall and examples of the new internal doors should be provided. Such a condition is considered relevant and necessary in the instance that permission is granted.

Internally, the listed building would make several alterations to the existing staircase within the more modern rear extension outshot. This would include the reconfiguration of the existing arrangement, changes to the existing associated studwork partition walls and alterations to the existing levels. A blockwork wall would at ground floor and stud partitions to the bathroom above would also be removed as part of the proposal.

As noted within the Conservation Officer's response, these internal works are considered to be contained to the more modern fabric of the building and therefore did not raise further concerns. The works to add double doors between the heightened ground floor room and sitting room within the original building are considered to have a greater impact on the existing historic fabric, however on balance these works were considered to be acceptable.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to preserve the special interest of the listed building and is considered to result in an overall neutral impact. The proposal would not significantly remove nor alter the existing historic fabric and as such would comply with the provisions of Policies DP26 and DP34 of the District Plan and the statutory duties as set out within the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

To summarise, it is considered that the proposals will have an acceptable impact on the listed building and the character and appearance of the area. As such, the application complies with Policies DP26 and DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, the Ansty and Staplefield Neighbourhood Plan, the Mid Sussex Design Guide, Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) act and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Stefan Galyas