

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/2068	Case Officer:	Andrew Horrell
Application Type:	Householder Application		
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:	1
--	--	-------------------------------	---

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

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/2068

**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 concerns about construction noise and noise from development.

CONSULTEE COMMENTS

Southern Water: No objections

West Sussex Naturespace: The following informative should be attached to planning consent:

"The applicant is reminded that, under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), it is an offence to (amongst other things): deliberately capture, disturb, injure, or kill great crested newts; damage or destroy a breeding or resting place; intentionally or recklessly obstruct access to a resting or sheltering place. Planning permission for a development does not provide a defence against prosecution under this legislation. Should great crested newts be found at any stage of the development works, then all works should cease, and a professional and/or suitably qualified and experienced ecologist (or Natural England) should be contacted for advice on any special precautions before continuing, including the need for a licence."

Additionally, all vegetation within the works area shall be maintained at a maximum height of 30mm until construction is completed through regular mowing or grazing in order to discourage great crested newts from using the site. All works shall be carried out in accordance with suggested measures following measures.

MSDC Ecology Consultant: The proposal is acceptable, subject to the conditions.

MSDC Tree Officer: I have reviewed the updated Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA), including the Tree Protection Plan (TPP), for this proposal and have no objection.

Please condition adherence to the AIA and TPP.

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

No objections to this application, subject to the Conservation Officer's satisfaction.

INTRODUCTION

Permission is sought to replace 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.

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 room, 8.1m in width with a height to the eaves of 2.8m and a maximum height of 3m. This would serve 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 the 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

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, the Site Allocations 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

DP37 - Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows

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 (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 policies:

DPN1 - Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery

DPN4 - Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows

DPB1 - Character and Design

DPB2 - Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets

DPB3 - Conservation Areas

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 also a material consideration and paragraphs 8, 11, 131, 135 and 207 - 215 are considered to be relevant to this application.

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'.

Policy DP34 of the District Plan is relevant to listed buildings and states:

'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.*
- 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'*

Policy DP35 of the District Plan states:

'Development in a conservation area will be required to conserve or enhance its special character, appearance and the range of activities which contribute to it. This will be achieved by ensuring that:

- o New buildings and extensions are sensitively designed to reflect the special characteristics of the area in terms of their scale, density, design and through the use of complementary materials;*
- o Open spaces, gardens, landscaping and boundary features that contribute to the special character of the area are protected. Any new landscaping or boundary features are designed to reflect that character;*
- o Traditional shop fronts that are a key feature of the conservation area are protected. Any alterations to shopfronts in a conservation area will only be permitted where they do not result in the loss of a traditional shopfront and the new design is sympathetic to the character of the existing building and street scene in which it is located;*
- o Existing buildings that contribute to the character of the conservation area are protected. Where demolition is permitted, the replacement buildings are of a design that reflects the special characteristics of the area;*
- o Activities such as markets, crafts or other activities which contribute to the special character and appearance of the conservation area are supported;*
- o New pavements, roads and other surfaces reflect the materials and scale of the existing streets and surfaces in the conservation area.*

Development will also protect the setting of the conservation area and in particular views into and out of the area.

New buildings of outstanding or innovative design may be acceptable in conservation areas provided that their impact would not cause material harm to the area.'

Principle DG11 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD states:

'Heritage assets and historic landscapes should be celebrated, enhanced and preserved where appropriate, for the enjoyment of existing and future residents. Where appropriate and providing it does not cause harm to the heritage assets or their setting, they should be carefully integrated into development proposals as they help to reinforce a sense of place and local identity.

Elsewhere new development should generally reflect the scale of adjacent areas and the settlement context within which it is located to deliver a coherent and consistent urban fabric. There may be potential to introduce a new character / development form and massing:

- On larger urban extensions; this will typically be within the middle of the site and associated with a new neighbourhood centre, spine road or the main open space.*

- In town centre locations defined as coarse grain areas and nearby sites identified on the brownfield sites register.'

Paragraphs 210, 212 - 215 of the NPPF are most relevant and state:

'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.'

In terms of design, policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex 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 protects valued townscapes and the separate identity and character of towns and villages;*
- 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 (see Policy DP27);*
- o creates a pedestrian-friendly layout that is safe, well connected, legible and accessible;*
- o incorporates well integrated parking that does not dominate the street environment, particularly where high density housing is proposed;*
- o positively addresses sustainability considerations in the layout and the building design;*
- o take the opportunity to encourage community interaction by creating layouts with a strong neighbourhood focus/centre; larger (300+ unit) schemes will also normally be expected to incorporate a mixed use element;*
- o optimises the potential of the site to accommodate development'.*

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.

Extensions should not result in a significant loss to the private amenity area of the dwelling.

There are two general approaches to extending a property:

- designing in the style of the existing building by closely matching its facing materials, architectural features, window sizes and proportions; and*
- designing in a contemporary style that takes its cues from key aspects of the existing building that might include its underlying form and proportions, facing materials, window design and other specific architectural features. The success of this approach is particularly reliant on high quality facing materials and finishes, and this will normally need to be demonstrated through detailed elevations and section drawings.*

Both approaches can create successful, well designed extensions that can be mutually beneficial to both the house and the wider area. All extensions and alterations should consider their impact on neighbouring properties (refer to Chapter 8 on residential amenity).'

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.

The gaps between dwellings can sometimes positively contribute to articulating (for example, through the consistent rhythm of repeated houses) and adding interest in a street frontage or by providing views / visible connections to the surrounding countryside. 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:

"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".

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 policies DP26, DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, principles DG49 and DG51 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide and the NPPF.

Highways Impact

Policy DP21 of the District Plan among other matters requires that:

'The scheme provides adequate car parking for the proposed development taking into account the accessibility of the development, the type, mix and use of the development and the availability and opportunities for public transport; and with the relevant Neighbourhood Plan where applicable.'

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.

Impact on Neighbouring amenities

In terms of impact on neighbouring amenities, Policy DP26 of the District Plan states that it must be demonstrated that any 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.

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.

The concerns raised over construction noise and noise from the development are noted. However, these would be short-term during the construction works and would be covered by Environmental Legislation.

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

Impact on Trees

Policy DP37 of the Mid Sussex District Plan relates to trees, woodland and hedgerows and supports the protection and enhancement of trees, woodland, and hedgerows, and encourages new planting.

A Norway Spruce (T11), a collection of Lawson Cypress trees (G7), a mature Cypress Hedge (G8) and the Leylandii Hedge (H2) along the northern boundary will need to be removed to make way for the proposed rear garage and some newly planted pleached trees.

The Mid Sussex Tree Officer has been consulted on the application and stated that no objection is given to the proposal subject to conditions. The Planning Officer agrees with this assessment.

The proposal therefore complies with DP37 of the Mid Sussex District Plan.

Ecology

Policy DP38 of the Mid Sussex District Plan relates to Biodiversity and seeks proposals to protect and enhance biodiversity.

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 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.

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 garage, and side bay window are considered to be acceptable, as are various internal and external alterations within the proposal. The impact on the Conservation Area is deemed neutral given the non-publicly visible location of the proposed rear extension. In addition, the proposal is deemed acceptable in terms of neighbouring amenities, trees, parking provision and ecology.

Notwithstanding this, the proposed single storey rear extension would be harmful to the special interest of the listed building. This is due to its scale, form and design. Coupled with this, the proposal taken together with the previous enlargements to the original dwelling leads to the original dwelling being overwhelmed by additions. 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 public benefits resulting from the development that would outweigh the identified harm to the Listed Building.

The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the requirements of policies DP26 and DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, principles DG49 and DG51 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide and the requirements of the NPPF. The application is therefore recommended for refusal.

Decision: Refusal

Case Officer: Andrew Horrell