

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/24/2944	Case Officer:	Katherine Williams
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent		
Proposal:	Construction of a single-storey extension and between the north elevation of the existing dwelling and the existing stable building. Conversion and alteration of existing stable building to habitable accommodation to include raising the roof of the building. Demolition of the existing detached garage building and construction of replacement garage and store building with habitable accommodation to the rear and first floor. Demolition of the existing porch to the north elevation, removal of existing door and infilling of existing door opening. Internal alterations to the existing dwelling to remove the existing Kitchen, widen an existing wall opening and install a glazed partition with door. Associated hard and soft landscaping works to comprise new terracing, steps and low-level retaining walls. Relocation of existing oil tank and installation of a replacement sewage treatment plan.		
Site:	Barlands, The Street, Warninglid, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5SZ, ,		
Validation Date	6 Mar 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	18 Apr 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Refusal	Recommendation Date:	12 Sep 2025
Target Date:	1 May 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	Katherine Williams

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Joanne Fisher	Date:	15 Sep 2025
Comments:			

--	--

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/24/2944

**Barlands, The Street, Warninglid, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5SZ,
Construction of a single-storey extension and between the north elevation of the existing dwelling and the existing stable building. Conversion and alteration of existing stable building to habitable accommodation to include raising the roof of the building. Demolition of the existing detached garage building and construction of replacement garage and store building with habitable accommodation to the rear and first floor. Demolition of the existing porch to the north elevation, removal of existing door and infilling of existing door opening. Internal alterations to the existing dwelling to remove the existing Kitchen, widen an existing wall opening and install a glazed partition with door. Associated hard and soft landscaping works to comprise new terracing, steps and low-level retaining walls. Relocation of existing oil tank and installation of a replacement sewage treatment plan.
Mr Thomas And Mrs Emma Hillary**

LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION

None received

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

MSDC Conservation Officer - objection

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No objection

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks listed building consent for a single-storey extension between the north elevation of the existing dwelling and the existing stable building. Conversion and alteration of existing stable building to habitable accommodation to include raising the roof of the building. Demolition of the existing detached garage building and construction of replacement garage and store building with habitable accommodation to the rear and first floor. Demolition of the existing porch to the north elevation, removal of existing door and infilling of existing door opening. Internal alterations to the existing dwelling to remove the existing Kitchen, widen an existing wall opening and install a glazed partition with door. Associated hard and soft landscaping works to comprise new terracing, steps and low-level retaining walls. Relocation of existing oil tank and installation of a replacement sewage treatment plant.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/24/2943 - Construction of a single-storey extension and between the north elevation of the existing dwelling and the existing stable building. Conversion and alteration of existing stable building to habitable accommodation to include raising the roof of the building. Demolition of the existing detached garage building and construction of replacement garage and store building with habitable accommodation to the rear and first floor. Demolition of the existing porch to the north elevation, removal of existing door and infilling of existing door opening. Internal alterations to the existing dwelling to remove the existing Kitchen, widen an existing wall opening and install a glazed partition with door. Associated hard and soft landscaping works to comprise new terracing, steps and low-level retaining walls. Relocation of existing oil tank and installation of a replacement sewage treatment plan. Under Consideration

DM/15/3480 - Minor internal alterations and installation of external oil tank. Granted

DM/15/3478 - Minor internal alterations and installation of external oil tank. Granted

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The property consists of a two storey detached dwelling located on the northern side of The Street, within the countryside and the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The dwelling is Grade II Listed and dates back to the 17th century, if not earlier. To the rear of the dwelling is an existing patio area with a stable building beyond, which is considered to be curtilage listed. To the rear of this building is an existing pitched roof double garage. The dwelling is accessed by an extended drive with curves around the curtilage of the property from the access onto the highway, which is positioned further to the west than the dwelling. This results in a side approach to the property and parking area.

The locality is characterised by areas of open fields and woodland with sporadic residential and agricultural properties along the highway which contribute to the character of the countryside and the landscape.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposal includes a single storey rear extension with a width and depth of some 8.7 metres and 7.5 metres. This extension would have a flat roof with an overall height of up to some 3.5 metres. This extension would be constructed in brick, standing seam zinc, green roof and aluminium fenestration. This extension would be linked to the stable building by a glazed link which would have a width and depth of approximately 3.7 metres and 1.4 metres, and an overall height to match the proposed extension.

The stable building would be converted to become part of the dwellinghouse providing a utility room, boot room and W.C. The end stores of the building would be used as a plant room and store. This conversion would include raising the roof form of the stable building by approximately 1.1 metres. These alterations would be constructed in materials to match the existing building.

The existing double garage would be replaced with a building with a width and depth of some 7.2 metres and 10.9 metres with a pitched barn hip roof with an overall height and eaves height of some 6.7 metres and 3.2 metres. This building would consist of a double garage, shed and home office on the ground floor with a bedroom, bathroom and store above. This building would be constructed in brick, black timber weather boarding, plain roof tiles and timber fenestration.

The proposal includes the removal of the existing rear porch to the dwelling house; the opening would be infilled with lime plaster to match. Internally a new glazed panel and sliding door would be added internally to divide the hall from the existing kitchen.

The proposal also includes the relocation of the oil tank which would be located to the north of the of the buildings and would be positioned beyond the proposed retaining wall and extended driveway. Beyond this would be a new sewage treatment plant.

The proposed location of the oil tank, new sewage treatment plant and replacement garage are physically separate from the listed building and curtilage listed stable building and therefore do not require listed building consent.

LIST OF POLICIES

DISTRICT PLAN (adopted 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.

No relevant policies.

Slaugham Neighbourhood Plan (made November 2016)

No relevant policies.

Mid Sussex Site Allocations Document (DPD)

Mid Sussex District Council adopted its Site Allocations Development Plan Document on 29th June 2022. The Site Allocations DPD identifies sufficient housing sites to provide a five year housing land supply to 2031 and also makes sure that enough land is allocated to meet identified employment needs.

There are no policies deemed relevant to this application.

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 stage 1 hearings were concluded on the 31st October 2024. There are unresolved objections to some of the Policies in the draft District Plan and 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 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)

Other Planning Guidance

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

ASSESSMENT

The LPA is under a duty by virtue of s.16(2) of the Listed Building and Conservation Area (LBCA) Act 1990 (Decision on application): *'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.'*

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.

Policy DP34 of the District Plan is relevant 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.'*

Paras 205, 212-215 of the NPPF state:

'205. In determining 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* 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.'

Principle DG11 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide 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 (refer to chapter 5):

- 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.'

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

'Barlands is a Grade II listed former farmhouse located in a rural position to the south west of Warninglid. The farmhouse is part of a historic farmstead which includes a small number of surviving former farm buildings to the east which from historic map regression appear to date from the 19th century or earlier and may (depending on their history of ownership and other criteria) be regarded as curtilage listed, as well as an ancillary building to the north (known as the stables) which from the submitted Heritage Statement dates from the 19th/early 20th centuries (being of a number of phases of work) and would certainly be regarded as curtilage listed, and a more modern garage building beyond this.

The submitted HS suggests that the core of the farmhouse is a small mid-16th century building with an open hall, overshoot cross passage and service rooms. The building appears to have been extended and substantially altered in a number of phases during the late 16th and 17th centuries, including the addition of a two storey plus attics extension to the eastern end, and the insertion of a substantial brick built chimneys stack, as well as the creation of a cellar. Further alterations were carried out in the late 17th and 18th centuries; during the 19th century further works took place including the underbuilding of the majority of ground floor external walls, new windows and tile hanging introduced to the rear, and internal alterations including a new stair and stair enclosure. The house was for some time during the 19th century divided into two cottages, but was reinstated as single dwelling during the 20th century.

The earliest fabric of the 'stables' building lies in the masonry base to its eastern end, which may represent the remains of an earlier building shown on the 1839 tithe map. The fabric above this is c. mid 19th century, and forms the eastern cell of the building. The western end of the building was rebuilt in more than one phase during the late 19th/early 20th century, and two small extensions made at either end of the building, which are thought to be WCs for each of the two cottages into which the house was then divided. Further alterations were made during the 20th century including infill of a previously open section to the southern elevation, addition of new windows, addition of a loft within the east end of the range, the installation of stall partitioning within the eastern end of the building, and refinishing of the floor in concrete. These alterations are thought to correspond with the reinstatement of the house as a single dwelling.

Based on the evidence within the historic building survey contained within the HS and our own site visits I would consider that the significance of the farmhouse to lie primarily in the following:

- The architectural evidential value of the survival of the fragmentary remains of the small building with open hall, over shot cross passage and at least one first floor chamber- as the HS notes this type of building was usually entirely rebuilt due to its modest scale, but is preserved here due to the particular nature of the successive building campaigns- as well as of the subsequent phases of its development, particularly the earlier work;

- The complex sequence of development of the house from that earliest phase to its current form, which has historical illustrative value in terms of the evolution of local socio-economic conditions and the domestic needs and aspirations of successive occupants;

- The construction and craftsmanship of the building's different phases, including the use of vernacular materials viewed within the landscape from which they were drawn;
- The relative lack of alteration to the footprint or immediate setting of the building from its appearance on 19th century maps with the exception of the addition of the new garage to the north; and
- The continuing relationship of the farmhouse and ancillary building to the north with the surviving historic farmstead buildings to the east, notwithstanding the intervening fencing and the new buildings which have been added to the farmstead.

The current proposal, which follows on from pre-application advice, is for internal and external works to the farmhouse and outbuildings to the north, including both the former stables directly to the north of the house and the modern garage building beyond this.

The proposed works include:

- Internal alterations to the listed farmhouse at ground floor;
- Removal of an existing rear porch and other alterations to the rear of the house;
- Construction of a substantial partly glazed extension to the rear of the house, linking the house to the former stables building;
- Alterations to the stables building both internally and externally including raising the height of the roof and alterations to the internal layout;
- Forming of a glazed link between the stables building and the proposed replacement garage (?);
- Demolition and rebuild of the modern garage building to provide a 1 ½ storey replacement building with garaging, and a study at ground floor and additional bedroom accommodation and storage above;
- Associated hard and soft landscaping and installation of a new sewage treatment plant.

To consider these works in turn:

- In respect of the internal alterations to the house at ground floor I would firstly note that these are not addressed in the submitted Heritage Statement- the Statement should be expanded to include commentary on these aspects of the scheme. The proposed new glazed panel/sliding door to the existing opening (no. 3 on the proposed ground floor plan key) appears to sit under a Phase 1 (mid 16th century) beam, which retains mortices and other evidence of earlier framing elements. Whilst (subject to discussion within an expanded HS) I would therefore consider that this aspect of the proposal may be acceptable in principle, great care would have to be taken in the design and location of the panel/door to ensure that it did not obscure or result in damage to fabric or features of interest. Further, more detailed information of this work should be provided, as we would wish to be assured that the principle of the work would be practical in terms of avoiding adverse impact on surrounding fabric. The proposed floor plan is also annotated at 5 to suggest a nib is to be cut back, but I am not clear from the drawing what is referred to. The ground floor plan within the HS suggests that this part of the building was largely altered during the 19th century, however due to the proximity of Phase 1 fabric I would require more clarity as to the location and level of significance of the fabric affected by this work.
- The rear porch appears to be modern in date, and its removal is not considered contentious in principle. The infilling of the doorway itself however is in my opinion potentially contentious- I would be interested to understand the date of the aspect of the building's plan form. If it were to date, for example, as seems likely, from the subdivision during the 19th century of the house into two cottages I would suggest that the door should be retained and fixed shut, rather than infilled, as this would be illustrative of a fairly significant aspect of the house's narrative. Again, the HS should be expanded to address this.
- At pre-application stage the principle of a link extension between the house and stables was regarded as contentious, due to the distance between the two buildings. Concerns were also raised regarding the scale, form and design of the link, in the context of the existing house and its setting.

Although some modifications have been made to the proposal as currently before us, in my opinion it raises similar issues in terms of the principle of the proposal, and also the scale of the extension (which remains very substantial), its form and its detailed design. In my opinion, putting aside the difficulty with the principle of linking the two historic buildings, any significant addition to the rear of the existing house, which as noted above largely retains its historic footprint which has not been significantly added to or altered since the 17th century, remains contentious. Even were a significant extension to be regarded as acceptable in principle, the scale of the addition as shown would be regarded as excessive.

The scale, form and position of the addition continue to essentially sever the house and the outbuilding to the north from the remaining historic farmstead to the east. As the HS suggests, despite the

intervening fencing there remains an appreciable relationship between the buildings which contributes positively to the setting and special interest of the farmhouse, and to the significance of the remaining elements of the historic farmstead. The high level windows shown to the eastern elevation of the extension will not be adequate mitigation for this.

I also consider that aspects of the detailed design of the proposed extension remain contentious, in particular the treatment of the eastern elevation which appears particularly unsympathetic to the context. Whilst I appreciate the reasoning behind the inclusion of the high level windows, they do not relate well to the form or proportions of the existing fenestration to the house, and do not do enough to prevent this elevation appearing stark and largely unrelieved, so that the house appears to 'turn its back' on the historic farmstead with which it was previously associated. This will be apparent in views from the direction of the farmstead and also likely from The Street, looking north east through the farmyard entrance, in which the house and farm buildings still appear as a group despite the intervening fence.

- At pre-application stage the principle of the conversion of the Stables building to ancillary accommodation was not considered contentious, however we had insufficient information to be able to comment meaningfully on some aspects of the detail of the works then proposed. The scheme has evolved since then, and now includes more invasive work, including in particular a significant increase to the roof height of the building, which would result in the complete loss of the existing roof structure. In my opinion, this aspect of the scheme is also contentious, in particular the loss of the historic fabric to the roof, the adverse impact on the existing, historic proportions of the building, which will have related directly to its use, and its relationship of scale with the house, the extent to which the southern elevation of this modestly scaled building is obscured by the proposed infill extension, and the adverse impact on the internal plan form and features of the building including the loss of the stall partitions, which while dating from the 20th century speak strongly of the narrative of the building.

- The proposed ground floor plan is annotated to show the indicative position of a future link between the altered stables building and the proposed replacement garage. This however is not shown on the proposed elevations. As was noted at pre-application stage any link between the two buildings is likely in the context of this scheme overall not to be favourably viewed as this would have the effect of increasing the effective footprint of the additions to the house even further.

- The proposed replacement garage is not considered contentious in principle. The proposed new garage is quite significantly bigger than the existing, but I do not consider given the lower position of this building on the slope dropping away to the north of the house that this would be necessarily problematic in itself, viewed in isolation with the remainder of the proposals. As part of the current scheme, however, this increase in bulk does contribute to the overbearing scale of the proposed new work to the rear of the house.

- The associated hard and soft landscaping works immediately around the buildings are intimately associated with the proposed extension and other works discussed above, so that it is difficult to comment these in isolation. However, I would note that the significant expansion of hard surfacing in the area around the house which appears to be shown to its north may be regarded as contentious. We would also need to see existing and proposed sections to allow us to understand the extent and nature of any regrading involved with this work before I could comment fully, as well as full details of the proposed bunded oil tank and sewage treatment plant.

In summary, although some aspects of the proposal may be acceptable in principle, viewed in isolation, others are considered contentious in principle and/or their scale, form and detailed design. In other respects, further information would be required for fully informed comment.

As it stands, I would consider that the proposed rear link extension and the works to the stables building would result when viewed in isolation in less than substantial harm to the special interest of the building, at around the mid-high range of that scale. However, it is not possible to comment fully on the impact of the scheme as whole without the further information mentioned above. The proposal is also, as submitted, contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34 (Listed buildings and other heritage assets), and the requirements of the Council's adopted Design Guide, specifically the design principles referring to domestic extensions.'

Following these comments an amended Heritage Statement has been submitted to provide the requested further information. The Conservation Officer has considered this information, and although these details are not fully addressed in detailed plans sufficient information has been provided to allow

the proposal to be fully addressed and a number of the alterations are acceptable subject to further details. However, the information provided has not changed the Conservation Officer's opinion on the acceptability of the proposed extension, link and alterations to the stable building who considers that:

'In summary, notwithstanding the further comments by the architect and the revised HS, the proposal remains in my opinion unacceptable in terms of its impact on the special interest of the listed farmhouse and curtilage listed stables, for the reasons set out again below and in my previous comments. This will be contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34. The works would result in less than substantial harm to the house and to the stables building, at around the mid-high range of that scale in both cases.'

The proposed internal alterations to the listed farmhouse and the removal of the existing rear porch and associated external alterations are considered to be of scale and form which would not have an adverse impact on the fabric of the building and are appropriate to the significance and special interest of the building.

The proposed single storey extension would extend from the original rear elevation of the dwelling across the rear courtyard area and would be linked to the existing stable building. The extension would be of a modern, flat roof design and of a scale and form which appears disproportionate to the form, scale and modest depth of the original farmhouse. This extension would be highly visible on the approach to the property along the driveway with views from the highway. The modern design of the extension, compounded by its scale, would fail to reflect the special character of the existing property and its farmstead setting. The western elevation of the extension is highly glazed with a comparatively solid eastern elevation, which would sever the remaining visual relationship with the historic farmstead to the east of the site. It is noted that there is a close boarded fence in place between the application property and the farmstead, however a level of visual relationship is still retained at present.

This extension would be linked to the curtilage listed stable building, which would also be converted to form part of the farmhouse. These works would include an increase in the height of the roof form of the building resulting in a loss of historic fabric of the existing roof form as well as the historic proportions of the building, which relate to its original use and its relationship with the farmhouse. This is considered to result in a poor proportioned building which would detract from its special character and the contribution it makes to the historic setting of the farmhouse. This is particularly evident in the position of the windows and doors on the elevations of the building and its visual separation from the roof form and the expanse of brickwork. It is noted that this alteration is proposed as it is considered by the applicant that the eaves are too low for practical use. From the site visit to the property the existing stable building is used as storage and no evidence that the use of the building for storage could not continue.

The combination of the proposed extension and conversion and alteration of the stable building would be of a scale and footprint which would overwhelm and dominate the original dwelling and would have harmful impact on the special interest of the listed building and the curtilage listed stable building, contrary to policy DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, the Design Guide and the relevant provisions of the NPPF.

In terms of the NPPF the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the heritage assets, as set out in paragraph 2015, and is weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The proposal relates to the enlargement of the existing residential property, and no specific public benefit for the proposal has been put forward. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not result in a public benefit of a domestic extension that would outweigh this harm.

CONCLUSION

The special interest of the farmhouse and curtilage listed stable building would be detracted by the design, form and scale of the proposed extension and alteration to the roof form of the stable building and would cause less than substantial harm to the special interest of the building. 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.

Decision: Refusal

Case Officer: Katherine Williams