

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/1764	Case Officer:	Andrew Horrell
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Replacement of later-addition single-storey rear extension with a new, single-storey rear extension. Removal of existing fireplace recess to the west elevation to allow for the construction of a bay window. Minor internal alterations at ground floor level to suit the proposed works, along with re-wiring and re-plumbing works throughout. Demolition of modern garage and construction of a new, single-bay garage within the rear garden. Associated hard and soft landscaping works		
Site:	St Johns Lodge, 151 High Street, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2HT, ,		
Validation Date	20 Jul 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	21 Aug 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	16 Sep 2026
Target Date:	14 Sep 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Andrew Horrell

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	2
--	--	-------------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	18 Sep 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/1764

St Johns Lodge, 151 High Street, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2HT, Replacement of later-addition single-storey rear extension with a new, single-storey rear extension. Removal of existing fireplace recess to the west elevation to allow for the construction of a bay window. Minor internal alterations at ground floor level to suit the proposed works, along with re-wiring and re-plumbing works throughout. Demolition of modern garage and construction of a new, single-bay garage within the rear garden. Associated hard and soft landscaping works
Mr And Mrs Broad

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

The Lindfield Society has commented stating that the applicant has taken on board objections to the previous proposals and therefore have no further comments.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEE COMMENTS

Place Services Ecology: No objection subject to condition.

West Sussex Naturespace: There would be no likely impact on great crested newts or their habitats.

MSDC Conservation Officer: The proposal is also in my opinion contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policies DP34 and DP35, although these currently attract very limited weight.

If on balance you are minded to approve the proposal, we need to ensure that the proposed elevations are updated to reflect all of the repair works indicated in the DAS (including the bothy elevations). Appropriate conditions relating to the detail of the scheme should also be added.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application subject to the Conservation Officers satisfaction.

INTRODUCTION

Permission is sought for the replacement of later-addition single-storey rear extension with a new, single-storey rear extension, the removal of existing fireplace recess to the west elevation to allow for the construction of a bay window, minor internal alterations at ground floor and the demolition of modern garage and construction of a new, single-bay garage within the rear garden with associated hard and soft landscaping works.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

CU/123/78 - Proposed single garage. (Approved)

CU/144/78 - Proposed single storey extension comprising new kitchen and minor alterations to existing lodge internally. (Approved)

CU/113/84 - Rear extension. (Approved)

CU/113/84/AP1 - Amended plans: Rear extension. Amended plans showing: Amendments. (Approved)

DM/25/2068 - Replace later addition rear extension with new single storey extension. Allow for two bay windows and chimney to western elevation including internal alterations. Demolish later addition garage and erect new single bay garage to rear garden with associate landscaping works. (Refused)

DM/26/1765 - Replacement of later-addition single-storey rear extension with a new, single-storey rear extension. Removal of existing fireplace recess to the west elevation to allow for the construction of a bay window. Minor internal alterations at ground floor level to suit the proposed works, along with re-wiring and re-plumbing works throughout. Demolition of modern garage and construction of a new, single-bay garage within the rear garden. Associated hard and soft landscaping works (pending consideration)

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

St John's Lodge is a Grade II listed detached dwelling set back from High Street accessed via an access serving No.149, 153 and 155 High Street. The dwelling is characterised by stonework, timber doors and windows. The dwelling has rear extensions and a detached garage to the front from the 1970s/1980s.

To the north of the site is the rear garden with close boarded fencing to fields beyond, to the south of the site is the driveway with no.149 beyond, to the west of the site is hedging to neighbours in The Welkin beyond and to the east is hedging and wall to access serving 153 and 155 characterised by garage building.

A public footpath runs to the side and rear of the site.

The site is within the built-up area of Lindfield and the Lindfield Conservation Area.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposed side bay window serving the drawing room approximately measures 1m in width, 3.85m in depth with a height of 2.5m.

The new sloped roofed single storey rear extension approximately measures 4.8m (some 3.45m from the current rear extension lean to building line), 6.45m in width with a height to eaves of 2.9m and a maximum height of 3.2m. This serves a lounge/dining room.

The proposed internal works include the existing reception room altered to a dining room, the existing utility room and WC and hallway opened up and the stonework exposed and stone arch restored. Within the snug the fireplace is to be restored and the side window shutters restored and refurbished, and the dining room altered to a study and the front window shutter is to be restored and refurbished. On the first floor the bathroom and en-suite serving bedroom 1 altered. Within the detached bothy the sauna and bathroom are to be altered.

External alterations include the existing rooflight altered to a conservation rooflight, within the snug the front vertical sliding shutters to the front and side elevations are to be refurbished. The existing front uPVC rainwater pipe are to be changed to cast iron The existing cement mortar is to be replaced with lime mortar on all original external walls. On the first floor to replace rear existing window within the en-suite is to match the adjacent bedroom window and the cill is to be lowered with a new wider rear window serving bathroom. The existing ridge tiles are to be repaired, and new front cross finial is proposed.

The existing garage to the front of the dwelling is to be removed .

A new rear garage is to be sited to the north-east of the dwelling close to the rear boundary of the curtilage with loose gravel driveway between the proposed garage and the bothy.

The proposed rear garage approximately measures 6.7m in depth, 7.25m in width with a height to eaves of 2.35m and an overall height of 5.8m. This serves a car and bike storage on the ground floor with storage above. Driveway gates between the bothy and proposed garage approximately measures 5.3m in width with a maximum height of 2.275m with parking for two vehicles to the front of the garage.

The proposed landscaping works include gravel and brick paving to the path around the dwelling, low level native hedging between the existing driveway and the side garden, stone patio to the side garden, Stone paving to the side of rear extension serving an outdoors dining/ entertainment area with created rear driveway enclosed from garden by hedging.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND LIST OF POLICIES

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 Lindfield and Lindfield Rural 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:

DP21 - Transport
DP26 - Character and Design
DP34 - Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets
DP35 - Conservation Area
DP38 - Biodiversity

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.

Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan

The Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan was formally made on 23 March 2016. There are no relevant policies for consideration.

Other Legislation

Planning (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 is currently at Examination with initial hearings held in February/March 2026. The Council is consulting on Main Modifications which are required to ensure the plan is legally compliant and sound. The District Plan remains at Examination until the Inspector has published his report, until that time 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:

DPN1 - Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery
DPB1 - Character and Design
DPB2 - Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets
DPB3 - Conservation Areas
DPT4 - Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure

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) (August 2026)

ASSESSMENT

Design, impact on heritage assets and the character of the area

The property is Grade II Listed and is within the Lindfield Conservation Area.

Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states

'In considering whether to grant planning permission (or permission in principle) for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, 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'.

Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states

'In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any powers under any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of conservation preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area'.

The site is located within the Lindfield Conservation Area.

A Conservation Area is defined as an area of *"special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance"*.

Policy DP35 of the District Plan relates to impact on Conservation Areas, but this is considered to have very limited weight as it is materially inconsistent with the NPPF, and greater weight should be given to policy HE9 of the NPPF.

Section 20 of the NPPF specifically relates to the historic Environment.

National Decision Making Policy HE9 specifically relates to Conservation Areas and states:

' 1. Development proposals within or affecting the significance of conservation areas should:

- a. Retain and conserve buildings and other features which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area where possible; and*
- b. Consider the area's special architectural or historic interest (as identified as part of the designation of the conservation area) in the design of development.*

2. Not all elements of a conservation area will necessarily contribute to its significance. Where a development proposal would result in the loss of a building or other element which contributes to the character or appearance of a conservation area that is desirable to conserve, the assessment of impact should take into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the

significance of the conservation area as a whole, and the effects of this considered in accordance with policies HE5 and HE6.

3. Proposals which conserve those elements of a conservation area that make a positive contribution to the area (or which better reveal its significance) should be supported'.

Policies HE5 and HE6 are relevant and state in part:

'Development proposals affecting heritage assets should be accompanied by an assessment of the significance of the assets affected (including any contribution made by their setting) and of the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is necessary to understand the potential effect of the proposal on their significance. The relevant historic environment record should be referred to in making this assessment, and appropriate expertise employed where necessary.

2. Assessments of the potential effects of development proposals on the significance of heritage assets (including through effects on their setting) should identify whether proposals would be likely to:

- a. Have a positive effect, which is where the significance of a heritage asset would be enhanced, or better revealed; or*
- b. Have no effect on the significance of a heritage asset; or*
- c. Result in harm to the significance of a heritage asset, either from work affecting the asset itself or from development within its setting. The degree of harm should be identified: substantial harm would occur where the development proposal would seriously affect a key element of the asset's significance;*

3. In making this assessment it is the effect on a heritage asset's significance rather than the scale of the development which should be considered.

4. Decision-makers should be satisfied that assessments accurately reflect the effects on heritage assets caused by development proposals'.

HE6: Proposals affecting designated heritage assets

'1. When considering the potential effect of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial 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 effect amounts to a positive effect, harm, substantial harm, or total loss of its significance.

2. Development proposals which would have a positive effect on a designated heritage asset should be supported.

3. Any harm to a designated heritage asset will be a matter of considerable importance and weight, which should be dealt with in accordance with paragraphs 4 to 6 of this policy.

4. Where a development proposal would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal. Important public benefits can include securing the long-term reuse of a vacant or underused listed building, and enabling energy efficiency and low carbon heating measures to be employed'.

DP26 of the District Plan relates to character and design. However, this policy is considered to have very limited weight as it is materially inconsistent with the NPPF, and greater weight should be given to policy DP3 of the NPPF.

Policy DP3 of the NPPF relates to key principle of well-designed places and requires development proposals to respond to their context (the history, character and features of their site and its setting), so that they integrate with and enhance their surroundings, amongst other things.

Principle DG49 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD states:

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

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

The Design Guide also contains Principles DG50 which relates specifically to side extensions and DG51 which specifically relates to rear extensions. DG50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide states:

'Side extensions should normally be subservient to the original dwelling and typically be set-back from the front of the house to help define the original building.'

Side extensions will therefore need to appropriately respond to the character of the street form and will not normally be accepted where they close an important gap and view'.

DG51 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide states:

'rear extensions which are not visible from the street and do not negatively impact on neighbouring properties can be expressed in many forms, including by adopting a contemporary architectural approach. With reference to DG49, they should nevertheless have consideration for the character of the existing building and the relationship of the extension with the side boundaries and adjacent buildings and gardens.'

The Council's Conservation Officer has been consulted on the application and has provided the following comments:

"As you will be aware, this application is the latest in a series of formal applications and pre-application advice relating to this site, for variations on the same proposals. As I have previously given an assessment of the nature and context of the site and its significance in heritage terms as part of previous comments on the earlier iterations of this scheme, and these are a matter of public record, I will not repeat this assessment here.

The current proposal, which follows on from pre-application advice, is for a similar scheme to those seen previously, including internal and external works to the Grade II listed house including a rear extension and side bay window extension, demolition of the existing garage to the southwest of the house and construction of a new larger garage within the gardens to the rear (northeast) of the building. Various repairs to the house and curtilage listed bothy are also proposed.

The proposal reflects the reduced scale and revised form of the rear extension seen as part of recent pre-application discussions, but appears to omit other considerations such as the potential to strip back to the original stone finish to internalised external walls within the existing 20th century two storey addition, and drainage works to protect the property (in particular the curtilage listed bothy) from a suggested flooding risk. This is unfortunate, as these aspects of the pre-application proposal were considered to result in potential heritage benefits, to be weighed against the harm which was identified from the scale of the rear addition when viewed cumulatively with the existing substantial two storey rear addition.

As noted in pre-application advice, relative to previous formal proposals the rear addition has been further reduced in size and amended to a simple rectangular shape, rather than the asymmetric footprint previously shown. The revised extension has glazing to two elevations (north and east) with solid masonry to the western side, sitting under a low-pitched lead roof.

The proposal is an improvement on the scheme which was recently refused in scale, form and detailed design, however as explained at pre-application stage I do continue to have concerns with respect to the

scale of the addition, particularly in terms of its cumulative impact on the character of the building when viewed alongside the existing 2 storey 1980s extension.

The applicant has previously noted positive aspects of the proposal in terms of removal of partitions within the existing ground floor addition, which has the potential to open out the space and better reveal, albeit internally, the original external configuration of this part of the building. The argument has also been made that the glazing to the eastern and northern sides of the building would allow external views towards these elevations which are blocked by the existing, solid rear wall of the 1980s addition, and that the glazing will better reveal the adjoining wall of the original rear lean-to structure.

I do see the validity of these points, although I remain of the opinion that the glazing and the day-to-day use of the extended dining and living room, with the furniture and fittings that this involves, will limit the extent to which the original ground floor building line will be perceived externally, notwithstanding the applicant's views on these matters. As noted above, a previously discussed proposal to remove the plaster finish to the internalised, originally external, walls of the building, which would have aided in the suggested improved appreciation of the original form of the house, does not appear to be included in the current proposals, despite our recommendation that this should be pursued. This also limits the benefit which will arise from the removal of internal partitions.

It should be noted that it is not possible to assess an appropriate relationship of scale based on measurements alone, as it is predominantly a visual matter, and will depend on context. It is also not correct to treat all parts of a listed building, at the time of its designation, as being of equal interest, as seems to be applicant's argument, for example when referring to it as a multi-phase building. Here, it is relatively straightforward to identify that the significance of St John's Lodge lies in its historic core. The existing addition detracts from that significance, in my professional opinion, and the further extension now proposed adds to that harm (although noting the mitigations identified above).

It is recognised good practice when considering the impact of works to a listed building, including extensions, to consider cumulative impact, and that must be a relevant consideration here. To quote the relevant Historic England Guidance GPA Note 2 'Managing Significance in Decision Taking': 'The cumulative impact of incremental small-scale changes may have as great an effect on the significance of a heritage asset as a larger scale change. Where the significance of a heritage asset has been compromised in the past by unsympathetic development to the asset itself or its setting, consideration still needs to be given to whether additional change will further detract from, or can enhance, the significance of the asset in order to accord with NPPF policies.' N.B. that the guidance does not differentiate in this respect between development occurring before or after designation of an asset.

The remaining aspects of the scheme, which have been discussed in previous comments, are not on balance considered contentious, subject to detail which could be reserved by condition. For clarity, as noted in previous advice, the positive aspects in heritage terms of the removal of the existing garage are noted, and are considered to balance the harm arising from the increased scale of the replacement garage within the rear garden of the property, which viewed in isolation has an adverse impact on the verdant nature of the setting of the building and this part of the Conservation Area. The heritage benefits of some of the other works to the listed house itself and to the bothy, including internal and external repairs, are also noted, but are not considered to outweigh the harms arising from the proposed rear extension, particularly as the one is not contingent on the other. However, I note that these external repairs, which according to the submitted DAS include replacement of rainwater goods on a differing alignment, are not shown on the proposed elevation, which should be amended accordingly.

In conclusion, in my opinion, the extension as amended unfortunately continues to result in a level of harm to the special interest of the building and to the character and appearance of the Lindfield Conservation Area, due to its scale and the cumulative impact with the existing substantial 2 storey rear addition, although this level will be reduced in comparison to the refused scheme. The heritage benefits arising from some other aspects of this scheme are unfortunately not sufficient, in my opinion, to outweigh this harm.

In relation to the current, updated NPPF, I would place this harm in both instances toward the lower end of the scale. The balancing exercise set out in paragraph HE6.4 will therefore apply. Paragraph HE9 will also be relevant in relation to the Conservation Area.

The proposal is also in my opinion contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policies DP34 and DP35, although these currently attract very limited weight.

If on balance you are minded to approve the proposal, can we please ensure that the proposed elevations are updated to reflect all of the repair works indicated in the DAS (including the bothy elevations). Appropriate conditions relating to the detail of the scheme should also be added, which I can assist with".

The proposed side extension forming a bay window matches that deemed acceptable under DM/25/2068 as is the proposed rear garage which would be viewed in the context of the existing bothy and surrounding neighbouring garage buildings.

The proposed rear extension is reduced in depth and width from the previously refused householder scheme DM/25/2068.

It is noted that harm to the special interest of the listed building is deemed to be caused from the rear extension element of the proposal in the view of the Conservation Officer. It is agreed that the proposed rear extension will result in some harm to the significance of the listed building, albeit it is lessened from the previously refused scheme given the reduction in size (depth and width). As such it is recognised that the proposal does conflict with the requirements of policy DP34 of the District Plan.

Having regard to the tests within the the NPPF, the identified harm should be weighed against any public benefits. It is considered that there are clear public benefits to the scheme, which are predominantly sited at highly visible points to the frontage of the building including the removal of the garage to the front which currently clearly detracts from the listed building. Whilst it is noted that the new garage to the rear is to be sited in a publicly visible location, this is primarily from the public right of way which goes along the eastern and northern boundary of the property rather than from the High Street itself, and it has a lesser impact than the existing structure.

The improvements to the front of the building, alongside the removal of the garage, include the replacement of existing uPVC rainwater pipe to be altered to cast iron, the restoration of the front stone cross finial and the repointing of the original building with natural lime mortar, as well as repointing the bothy and linking wall with the reinstatement and repair of decorative ridge tiles and internally removing partitions to allow for the revealing the original ground floor footprint and other beneficial internal works are also noted.

Therefore, having regard to policy HE6 it is felt on balance that the benefits of the scheme, which allow for the listed building to be better publicly revealed, are such that they outweigh the harm caused by the proposal to the significance of the listed building, in this case.

The Conservation Officer has raised concerns on the impact of the rear extension to the Lindfield Conservation Area. However, it is Officers view, as it was under the 2025 application, that as this extension is not readily publicly visible from the Conservation Area that the proposal would result in a neutral impact and not cause harm to the Conservation Area. Conditions will be placed on any approval to allow for the LPA to control the materials and landscaping to protect the listed building and conservation area.

Therefore, while the identified harm to the listed building means the proposal is contrary to policy DP34 of the district plan, it is considered that the reduced depth and width of the proposal from the previously refused scheme and the benefits of the scheme primarily to the front of the property outlined above, mean the harm to the significance of the listed building is, in this instance outweighed. Therefore, in balance the proposal complies with DP26 and DP35 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, principles DG49-DG51 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide and policies DP3, HE5, HE6 and HE9 of the NPPF.

Highways Impact

Policy DP21 of the District Plan seeks to ensure that schemes are sustainably located to minimise the need for travel, and protect the safety of road users and pedestrians, and seeks to provide adequate

parking in relation to development proposals. Policy DP21 is considered to have very limited weight as it is materially inconsistent with the NPPF, and greater weight should be given to policies TR3 and TR4 of the NPPF.

Policy TR3 of the NPPF in part states:

'Opportunities should be taken to utilise existing or proposed transport infrastructure'

Policy TR4 of the NPPF in part states:

'Provide a suitable number of parking spaces for a range of transport modes where appropriate, reflecting the location and nature of the development (including its connectivity), any locally-set standards in the development plan, and including adequate provision of spaces and infrastructure that allow for the charging of electric vehicles in safe, accessible and convenient locations'.

The proposal is considered to maintain the current level of parking on the site. The proposed detached garage is shown to utilise the same access as the existing dwelling and the proposal is not considered to alter the current access arrangements.

As such, the proposal is considered to comply with the Policy DP21 of the District Plan as well as TR3 and TR4 of the NPPF.

Impact on Neighbouring amenities

In assessing the potential impact of the proposed development works upon the neighbouring amenities consideration needs to be given to District Plan Policy DP26.

However, this policy is considered to have very limited weight as they are materially inconsistent with the NPPF, and greater weight should be given to policies L2 and P3 of the NPPF.

Policy L2 of the NPPF in part states:

'Maintain safe access and egress for occupiers and users, and acceptable living standards for residents and neighbours in terms of access to daylight, sunlight, privacy and external amenity space'

P3 of the NPPF states in part that:

'Development proposals should be appropriate for their location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, whether these effects are on or off-site; and whether this is as a result of the development itself or the product of preexisting conditions in its vicinity. In assessing the potential effects of pollution, consideration should be given to the potential sensitivity of the site, and its intended occupiers and users, as well as that of the environment and population in the surrounding area (including where certain groups could be particularly vulnerable to its effects, such as children and older people)'.

Given the detached nature of the dwelling and surrounding dwellings, the impact on light and outlook will not be significantly harmed.

In terms of overlooking and loss of privacy, as a ground floor enlargement to the dwelling. It is not deemed that the level of overlooking will be significant as it is no more than would be expected within the built-up area.

There are no first-floor openings within the proposed garage.

Therefore, in terms of neighbouring amenities, the proposal is deemed to comply with DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and policies L2 and P3 of the NPPF.

Ecology

Policy DP38 of the Mid Sussex District Plan relates to biodiversity, however, this policy is considered to have very limited weight as they are materially inconsistent with the NPPF, and greater weight should be given to policy N2 of the NPPF.

Policy N2 of NPPF in part states: *'Minimise any adverse impacts on biodiversity and include features which support priority or threatened species'*

The submitted bat roost assessment confirmed that St John's Lodge (B1) contained two confirmed roosts, and had high bat roost suitability, the Bothy (B2) had moderate bat roost suitability, and the Garage (B3) and Shed (A1) had negligible bat roost suitability.

The assessment found that no bat roosts were recorded in the areas that will be directly impacted by construction of the single-storey extension, or ridge tile repairs; therefore, there is negligible potential for the proposed development.

The submitted ecological appraisal recommends the provision of bird boxes and bat boxes.

The Council's Ecologist consultants have been consulted on the application and considered that the proposal is acceptable on ecology terms subject to conditions. This is agreed with by the officer. It is therefore considered that this proposal would also comply with the aims of policy DP38 of the Mid Sussex Plan and N2 of the NPPF.

Biodiversity Net Gain

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

Other

A letter was received regarding the submitted regarding the location and block plan being incorrect in not showing the correct land ownership. This has been amended to show the garage adjacent to the site being within the ownership of the applicant.

PLANNING BALANCE AND 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.

It has been identified that the proposed rear extension would result in some harm to the significance of the listed building and as such the proposal is contrary to policy DP34 of the District Plan.

It is recognised that the rear and side extensions are modest in size and scale and that they will not be readily visible to public, while using sympathetic materials which would character of the dwelling. In this instance, public benefits have been identified that allow for the front of the property to be enhanced, which with internal works and other alterations would allow the original part of dwelling to be more visible to the public. As such the public benefits in this instance are considered to outweigh the identified harm to listed building. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposal would have a neutral impact on the Lindfield Conservation Area is deemed caused. The impact on ecology, parking standards and neighbouring amenities is deemed acceptable subject to condition.

In conclusion, while the proposal would conflict with policy DP34 of the District Plan, it accord with the requirements of policies DP21, DP26, DP35 and DP38 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and policies DP3, HE4, HE5, HE6, HE3, HE9, L2, N2 and P3 of the NPPF. It is therefore considered acceptable.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Andrew Horrell