

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/2069	Case Officer:	Andrew Horrell
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent		
Proposal:	Replace later addition rear extension with new single storey extension. Installation of bay window to western elevation including internal alterations. Demolish later addition garage and erect new single bay garage to rear garden with associate landscaping works.		
Site:	St Johns Lodge, 151 High Street, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2HT, ,		
Validation Date	18 Aug 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	14 Apr 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Refusal	Recommendation Date:	2 Jun 2026
Target Date:	13 Oct 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	Andrew Horrell

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	3
--	--	-------------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	Joanne Fisher	Date:	4 Jun 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/2069

**St Johns Lodge, 151 High Street, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2HT,
Replace later addition rear extension with new single storey extension. Installation of bay window to western elevation including internal alterations. Demolish later addition garage and erect new single bay garage to rear garden with associate landscaping works.
Mr And Mrs Broad**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

1 letter raising comments on the grounds of noise.

1 letter of support to the scheme.

1 letter of objection in terms of the scale and design of the proposal.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

MSDC Conservation Officer: I have previously noted that the scheme does include works which would be regarded as beneficial in heritage terms, and I remain mindful of this. However, in my opinion the unsympathetic scale, form and design of the proposed rear extension continue to result in harm to special interest of the listed building and to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area which will outweigh these benefits.

The proposal therefore remains contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policies DP34 and DP35. In terms of the NPPF, I would place the harm arising at around the midpoint of the less than substantial scale in terms of the listed building, and the low-mid point in terms of the Conservation Area, such that the balancing exercise set out in paragraph 215 will apply. In carrying out this balancing exercise, the Council must also be mindful of the requirements of paragraph 212 of the NPPF that the conservation of heritage assets must carry great weight, and of paragraph 213 that any harm to a designated heritage asset must have clear and convincing justification.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application. In response to the original plans this was subject to the Conservation Officer's satisfaction.

INTRODUCTION

Listed building consent is sought for the replacement of a later addition rear extension with new single storey extension to allow for a bay window to western elevation including internal alterations. The demolition of existing garage and the erection of new single bay garage to rear garden with associate 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. (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

Permission is sought for a single storey rear extension, a new single storey extension to allow for a bay window to the western elevation including internal alterations. The demolition of an existing garage and the erection of a new single bay garage to the rear garden.

The proposed side bay window serving the drawing room approximately measures 1m in width, 3.7m in depth with a height of 2.5m.

The new sloped roofed single storey rear extension approximately measures 5.9m from the WC and 4.5m from the drawing, 8.1m in width with a height to eaves of 2.8m and a maximum height of 3m. This serves a kitchen/dining room.

The proposed internal works include the existing reception room altered to a drawing room, the existing kitchen altered to a WC and utility room and the dining room altered to a study and reinstate the fireplace hearth and surround within study. On the first floor the bathroom altered, existing fireplaces altered and the chimney stack to return on the first floor. Within the detached bothy the sauna is altered to an en-suite.

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 uPVC rainwater pipe is to be changed to iron pipe and a lean to roof covering is proposed to the top of chimney stack. The existing cement mortar is to be replaced with lime mortar on eastern and southern elevations with the existing cement render replaced with natural coloured smooth render on the western elevation. 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. A new lime render chimney stack with the upgrading of existing ridge tiles and new front 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,

viburnum and pleached trees to the rear of rebuilt 2m high stone boundary wall on front and side boundaries. Stone paving to the side of rear extension serving an outdoors dining/ entertainment area with created rear driveway enclosure 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 policy:

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

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

There are no relevant policies.

Other Legislation

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Other Material Considerations

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 (Regulation 19) is currently at Examination and hearings were concluded on the 19th March 2026. 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 policy:

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)

ASSESSMENT

District Plan Policy DP34 relates to listed buildings and other heritage assets and states:

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

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

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.'

Paragraphs 210, 212-215 of the December 2024 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) are relevant and state that:

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

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

212. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

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

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;*

b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II 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;*
- c) and conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.*

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

The Conservation Officer has commented on the application stating the following:

"MSDC Conservation Officer: St John's Lodge is a Grade II listed detached house located in a backland position to the west of Lindfield High Street, within the Conservation Area. The building, which is the Gothic style, dates from the mid 19th century, and is the former schoolmaster's house associated with the former National School which opened in 1856 just to the south. This building, which was later in use as private and Sunday school and then a Mission Hall, survives as a residential conversion, but is not listed, although it has group value with the Lodge, and would be regarded as a non-designated heritage asset. The name of the property reflects the former name of the parish church, which is now known as All Saints, but until the late 19th/early 20th century was called St John the Baptist's Church. A contemporaneous outbuilding survives within the garden to the north-east of the house. A more detailed history of the building's origins is provided in the Historic Building Assessment submitted as part of the current submission.

The site is also within the setting of a pair of much older Grade II listed buildings, Little Blacklands and Firs Cottage which are located to the road frontage to the west of the Lodge.

The Lodge has been previously substantially extended to the north-west, with the original L shaped 19th century plan infilled in the later 20th century by a two-storey extension under twin gabled roofs. A modern garage building sits to the south-west of the house, at the end of the access driveway running between the house and former school.

The internal works are acceptable.

The existing garage and sheds etc. are modern and are not of any special interest- the garage in particular is quite visually prominent and detracts from the setting of the listed building and of the adjacent former school house (NDHA). Their removal is therefore not considered contentious.

Had the application been otherwise acceptable, I would have suggested some reconsideration of the balance of hard and soft landscaping forming part of the proposal (e.g. a potential reduction in the extent of the patio areas adjacent to the house) to reduce the overall impact on the verdant nature of the garden.

The proposed garage is not in itself considered contentious in principle.

Although the footprint and height (relative to the existing building) of the proposed addition have been reduced, it remains in my opinion overscaled. I have indicated both at pre-application stage and in my initial response to this application in September 2025 that any substantial extension to this already

heavily extended listed building would be unlikely to be favourably viewed due to the cumulative adverse impact on the original and characteristic modest scale of the listed building.

This remains the case- as shown, the proposed extension would exacerbate the already unfavourable relationship of scale between the historic core of the building and the additions to it, and the original form and footprint of the house will be further obscured. The angled footprint of the extension also remains contentious in its poor relationship with the form of the original house and in the manner in which it extends across and partly hides the surviving original rear elevation of the house in all but the closest views. Its attachment to the western end of the existing original lean-to element to the rear elevation, as noted previously, will also blur the distinction between the modern and the original elements of the rear of the house.

This element of the proposal therefore remains contentious.

The proposal for alterations to the side of the house has been amended to remove the proposed chimney from the scheme, with instead a single flat roofed bay window being introduced. This addresses the previously raised concerns relating to the juxtaposition of the chimney stack and projecting bay windows, and as the work only affects the modern extension to the house, and is in itself a relatively modest intervention, I would consider that this aspect of the proposal is now acceptable.

I have previously noted that the scheme does include works which would be regarded as beneficial in heritage terms, and I remain mindful of this. However, in my opinion the unsympathetic scale, form and design of the proposed rear extension continue to result in harm to special interest of the listed building and to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area which will outweigh these benefits.

The proposal therefore remains contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policies DP34 and DP35. In terms of the NPPF, I would place the harm arising at around the midpoint of the less than substantial scale in terms of the listed building, and the low-mid point in terms of the Conservation Area, such that the balancing exercise set out in paragraph 215 will apply. In carrying out this balancing exercise, the Council must also be mindful of the requirements of paragraph 212 of the NPPF that the conservation of heritage assets must carry great weight, and of paragraph 213 that any harm to a designated heritage asset must have clear and convincing justification."

The Conservation Officer considers the internal works proposed are broadly acceptable as well some external works to the dwelling as well as the removal of the existing garage and the installation of a new garage as well as proposed fencing. Officers agree with this.

However, as set out in the Conservation Officer's comments, concern remains regarding the form, scale and design of the proposed single storey rear extension. Having considered the above comments, the Planning Officer agrees with these concerns and considers that the cumulative combination of the existing 1980s extension and the proposed rear addition to this is such that it is considered to have an overbearing impact in terms of scale and bulk, to the original building. Coupled with this, the Planning Officer agrees that the manner in which the rear extension extends across the rear of the property partly hides the surviving original rear elevation of the house in all but the closest views. Its attachment to the western end of the existing original lean-to element to the rear elevation will blur the distinction between the modern and the original elements of the rear of the house.

Part of the proposal is to make improvements internally and externally on the two storey infill extension from the 1980s which is a benefit of the scheme. Whilst it is noted that the cumulative impact of previous additions which were made prior to the listing, as set out under principle DG49 of the Design Guide, extensions should allow the original building to remain the dominant element of the property. Given the footprint of the original house and the existing two storey infill extension, it is Officers view that the combined scale of these additions with the proposed rear single storey extension would be harmful to the property, the listed building.

Therefore, it is Officers view that the scale, form and design of the proposed rear extension would result in an unsympathetic addition to the dwelling and taken cumulatively with previous additions would result in an overbearing impact to the original building. As such there would be a harmful impact to the special interest of the listed building.

The Conservation Officer has raised concerns on the impact of the rear extension to the Lindfield Conservation Area. However, it is Officers view 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.

In terms of the impact, it has been identified that the proposed rear extension would result in less than substantial harm to the listed building. Where the harm would be less than substantial, in terms of the NPPF, the criteria set out in paragraph 215 would apply. This states that *'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'*.

This is the balancing exercise that must be undertaken by the decision maker, ensuring that considerable importance and weight is given to the less than substantial harm to the heritage asset that has been identified.

The property remains in its original use, as a dwelling, and is not considered to be currently at risk. Whilst the benefits of scheme, namely but not exclusively of the removal of the existing garage and sheds, the replacement of uPVC rainwater goods with metal, the alterations to the 1980s enlargement and the reinstatement of the front gable finial are noted; it is Officers view that the harm caused to the heritage asset identified is greater than the benefits of the scheme.

Notwithstanding the above, there is no compelling evidence to demonstrate that the proposal is necessary to secure the optimum viable use of the property as whole. The property remains in its original use, as a dwelling, and is not considered to be currently at risk. Whilst it is noted that the proposed extension would enhance the living accommodation within the building, this is a private benefit and does not fall to be considered in the balance. Furthermore, the continued viable use of the building as a residential dwelling is not dependent on the proposal as the building has an ongoing residential use that would not cease in its absence.

In terms of impact on heritage assets, it should be noted that National Planning Practice Guidance states that public benefit 'should not just be a private benefit'.

Therefore, as no public benefits have been identified that would outweigh the harm identified in heritage terms, the proposal would fail the assessment within the NPPF and would not comply with policy DP34 and 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 listed building consent application within the meaning of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990. As a listed building consent application, this development is exempt from the requirement to provide biodiversity net gain.

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.

The proposed rear extension, due to its scale, form and design, would result in an unsympathetic addition to the dwelling. As such there would be a harmful impact to the special interest of the listed building. The harm is considered to be less than substantial and thus para 215 of the NPPF applies. In this case there are not considered to be any material public benefits resulting from the development that would outweigh the identified harm.

The harm caused by the proposed development would clearly outweigh any public benefits and consequently the proposal cannot be supported. It is also relevant that the continued viable use of the building as a residential dwelling is not dependent on the proposals.

It is therefore considered that the proposal would be contrary to policy DP34 of the District Plan, the requirements of the NPPF and the Listed Building and Conservation Area (LBCA) Act 1990.

It is recommended that listed building consent is refused.

Decision: Refusal

Case Officer: Andrew Horrell