

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/0593	Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Proposed attached two bay garage with store.		
Site:	Little Lower Ease, Cuckfield Road, Ansty, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5AL, ,		
Validation Date	10 Mar 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	7 Jul 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	24 Jun 2025
Target Date:	5 May 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Stefan Galyas</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Steven King</i>	Date:	25 Jun 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/0593

**Little Lower Ease, Cuckfield Road, Ansty, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5AL,
Proposed attached two bay garage with store.
Mr And Mrs Ray Bate**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

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

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Conservation Officer: No objection.

Tree Officer: *'I have reviewed the Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA) for this proposal and have no objections.'*

Drainage: No objection.

Southern Water: No objection.

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Parish Council: *'The committee's recommendation is that MSDC should give permission.'*

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for the development of a single storey, two bay garage extension with a tool store.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/21/0486 - Construction of 5 bedroom detached dwelling. Refused 01.04.21.

DM/21/0486 - Construction of 3 bedroom detached dwelling. Refused. Dismissed at appeal 14.02.22.

DM/23/1506 - Conversion of disused barn to a three bedroom residential dwelling within existing garden and expanded parking area. (Amended plans received 06.12.2023). Permission 13.02.24.

DM/23/2507 - Conversion of disused barn to a three bedroom residential dwelling within existing garden and expanded parking area. (Amended plans received 06.12.2023). Permission 27.09.24.

DM/25/0594 - Proposed attached two bay garage with store. Pending consideration.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Little Lower Ease is a Grade II listed building situated on the western side of Cuckfield Road. This application relates to an outbuilding, situated to the north of the dwelling, that is considered to be curtilage listed. The existing building is single storey, with a plain tiled roof, and has brickwork as well as featheredge weatherboard walls. Existing windows and doors are timber.

The application site is located outside the Built-up Area Boundary for Ansty and is therefore within the countryside. To the north of the site is a private access track and Public Right of Way Bridleway, which

has a post and rail fence along it. Brushwood Farm is located to the west, whilst Streams Farm is to the south and both have planted boundaries.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The application seeks planning permission for the development of a single storey extension which would house a double garage and store. The extension would have a maximum length of approximately 6.8m, 9.6m wide, have an eaves height of 2m and a ridge height measuring at 4.7m. Proposed external materials would comprise oak featheredge boarded walls over a multi stock brick plinth, handmade clay plain roof tiles, cast aluminium rainwater goods, timber casement windows and timber ledged and braced garage doors.

The existing parking area to the north of the site would be expanded as would the area of block paving to the east of the existing dwelling. These areas would utilise salvaged block paving from the existing driveway and new matching paving in a 'harvest' colour. A patio would also be constructed to the west of the existing dwelling which would be composed of Indian stone slabs.

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 Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common 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:

DP12: Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside

DP26: Character and Design

DP34: Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets

DP37: Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows

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

Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan (Made March 2015)

Relevant Policies:

HurstC1 - Conserving and Enhancing Character

Other Legislation

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 66(1) - Special regard to be had to the preservation of a listed building or its setting.

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

DPC1 - Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside

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;

- Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside
- Impact on Heritage Assets and Character and Design
- Impact on Neighbouring Amenities
- Trees Impact
- Biodiversity Net Gain

Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside

Policy DP12 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states:

'The countryside will be protected in recognition of its intrinsic character and beauty. Development will be permitted in the countryside, defined as the area outside of built-up area boundaries on the Policies Map, provided it maintains or where possible enhances the quality of the rural and landscape character of the District, and:

- o it is necessary for the purposes of agriculture; or*
- o it is supported by a specific policy reference either elsewhere in the Plan, a Development Plan Document or relevant Neighbourhood Plan.'*

Given the domestic nature of the proposal within the existing dwellings established residential curtilage, the proposed development is considered to protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

Due to the above, the proposal complies with DP12 of the Mid Sussex District Plan.

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 aesthetic (fortuitous) value and historical (illustrative) value. The building also possesses group value with the former farm building to the north.

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.

Policy DP26 of the District Plan states:

'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'*

Among other matters, Policy HurstC1 of the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan requires new development within the countryside to maintain or where possible, enhance the quality of the rural and landscape character of the parish Area.

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.'

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 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

The existing building is considered to be appreciated within a rural setting and the garden amenity space contributes positively towards the rural character of the context within which they are appreciated. It is noted that the existing hard landscaping between the existing barn and the existing farmhouse has been designed to maintain a sense of connection between the two buildings.

It is noted that historical map regression shows during the 19th century that there was an evolving three-sided farmyard which included an element to the north and further buildings to the east. By the 20th century the north and eastern buildings appear to have been demolished.

The proposed development would extend the existing linear barn through a perpendicular offshoot to the northern side. A new double bay garage and tool store would be housed within the proposed extension which would utilise a pitched roof design. The use of the pitched roof design is considered to relate well to the existing building whilst matching clay plain tiles and featheredge weatherboarding materials would help the proposal assimilate with the existing. The form of the link between the existing barn and extension is considered to remain subservient towards the existing with a reduced ridge height. This is considered to help the proposal to be read as a later addition.

Whilst the proposed extension would sit perpendicular to the existing linear barn, it is considered that this offshoot would help partially re-instate the existing farmyard. As such, this is considered to constitute a modest conservation benefit.

The area of existing hardstanding would be expanded to the north of the building which is not considered to be an excessive increase when compared to the existing arrangement. It was confirmed by the Applicant that no further alterations were proposed in relation to the soft landscaping on site.

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, Policy HurstC1 of the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan and the statutory duties as set out within the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenities

In terms of impact upon neighbouring amenities, Policy DP26 in part seeks to ensure that development: *'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 (see DP29);'*

The proposed extension would be set in excess of 20m from the nearest neighbouring property to the north at Pond Lye Barn. As such, this distance is considered to help overcome a significant overbearing impact. Furthermore, the proposed window opening to the boot room on the western elevation is not considered to give rise to a significant overlooking impact.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered to comply with the provisions of policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan in terms of neighbouring amenities.

Impact on Trees

In relation to new developments impact on trees, policy DP37 of the District Plan states that: *'The District Council will support the protection and enhancement of trees, woodland and hedgerows, and encourage new planting. In particular, ancient woodland and aged or veteran trees will be protected.'*

Development that will damage or lead to the loss of trees, woodland or hedgerows that contribute, either individually or as part of a group, to the visual amenity value or character of an area, and/ or that have landscape, historic or wildlife importance, will not normally be permitted.'

There is an existing mature oak tree to the north-western corner of the site and an arboricultural implication assessment was submitted which identified measures to protect the tree throughout the construction phase. This included details of tree protection fencing and suitable storage of building materials. Following a consultation with the Tree Officer, no further objections were raised.

Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to meet the provisions of Policy DP37 of the District Plan.

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.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

To summarise, it is considered that the proposals will have an acceptable impact on the listed building, the character and appearance of the area and neighbouring amenities. As such, the application complies with Policies DP12, DP26, DP34 and DP37 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policy HurstC1 of the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan, the Mid Sussex Design Guide, Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) act and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Stefan Galyas