

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/1765	Case Officer:	Andrew Horrell
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent		
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:	1
--	--	-------------------------------	---

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

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/1765

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

A comment was made regarding the block plan being inaccurate. A new block plan was then provided.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

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 both 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

Listed building consent 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/25/2069 - 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/26/1764 - 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.

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 (3.45m from the current rear extension 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:

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.

Relevant policies.

None relevant.

Neighbourhood Plan

The Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan was formally made on 23 March 2016

Relevant policies:

None relevant

Other Legislation

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Other Material Considerations

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.

Mid Sussex District Plan 2021-2039 Submission 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 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:

DPB2 Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (August 2026)

Policies HE4, HE5 and HE6 and most relevant and state the following:

HE4

'1. Heritage assets, as an irreplaceable resource, should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. To achieve this, development proposals which would affect the significance of heritage assets, including any contribution made by their setting should:

- a. Maintain or secure a use consistent with their conservation, taking into account the importance of maintaining the assets, the positive contribution they can make to sustainable communities including local economies, and the positive contribution they can make to local character and distinctiveness; and*
- b. Avoid (or if that is not possible, minimise) harm to the significance of heritage assets, and instead conserve this significance.*

2. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (including from development within its setting) should have a clear and convincing justification in accordance with the policies in this chapter.

3. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the asset should not be taken into account in any decision relating to the asset.

4. Proposals for enabling development, which would otherwise conflict with other policies in this Framework and/or those in the development plan, but which would secure the future conservation of a heritage asset, should be considered on the basis of whether the conservation benefits outweigh the disbenefits of departing from the policies concerned'.

HE5:

' 1. 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)'.

HE6:

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.'

Section 16 (2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states:

'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.'

ASSESSMENT

Impact on Listed Building

District Plan Policy DP34 will be relevant, this policy seeks to safeguard the significance and special interest of listed buildings. This is considered to have very limited weight as it is materially inconsistent with the NPPF, and greater weight should be given to HE4, HE5 and HE6 of the NPPF.

Policy HE6 of the NPPF is also relevant and sets out that substantial weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets.

The Conservation Officer has commented stating the following:

"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.

Therefore, the proposal is deemed to be comply with policy DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and the policies HE4, HE5 and HE6 of the NPPF".

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 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.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

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. Therefore, the proposal is considered to comply with policies HE4, HE5 and HE6 of the NPPF.

Listed Building Consent is therefore recommended for approval, subject to appropriate conditions.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Andrew Horrell