

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/0404	Case Officer:	Emily Wade
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent		
Proposal:	To take down existing North and West free standing garden walls and rebuild them around the full rear property boundary and replace the garden gate like-for-like.		
Site:	Wyncote, 63 High Street, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2HN, ,		
Validation Date	4 Mar 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	22 Apr 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	19 May 2025
Target Date:	29 Apr 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Emily Wade</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	19 May 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/0404

**Wyncote, 63 High Street, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2HN,
To take down existing North and West free standing garden walls and rebuild them around the
full rear property boundary and replace the garden gate like-for-like.
Miss Joanne Taylor**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Archaeology consultant (Place Services) - No objections

The West Sussex Historic Environment Record (HER) shows that the proposed development is located within the historic settlement of Lindfield, as encompassed by an Archaeological Notification Area (HER DWS8637). The High Street was the principal urban street of the village by the 13th century; the medieval burgrave plots are well preserved, both in terms of side boundaries and rear boundaries, although it is unclear as to how plots have been altered by amalgamation and subdivision prior to large-scale mapping in the nineteenth century. The rarity of the survival and condition of plots and, especially, the late medieval and post-medieval buildings; the completeness of historic street-front; the visibility of much of the historic fabric; and the archaeological potential all contribute to the significant nature of the historic core.

However, the proposed development is very minor in scope and the groundworks and below ground impact from the scheme is likely to be limited. This suggests that it is unlikely significant archaeological remains will be impacted by the proposals.

Accordingly, I have no recommendations in relation to this application.

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No objection.

INTRODUCTION

Wyncote is one half of a II* listed building fronting onto Lindfield High Street, within the Conservation Area. The current proposal is for works to the rear of the building, to rebuild an existing brick wall and partly change its alignment so that it encloses the entirety of the land falling within the ownership of no. 63. This means that the wall will extend a short distance across the rear elevation of no. 65.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None relevant.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Wyncote (no. 63) is with the adjoining building The Old Bakery (no. 65) one half of a Grade II* listed building fronting onto Lindfield High Street, within the Conservation Area. The current proposal relates to the rear yard to the building.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The current proposal, which has been amended on Officer advice, is for the reconstruction and extension of the existing brick wall enclosing the rear yard to the property. The works will extend the wall to enclose an area which lies to the rear of the neighbouring building at no. 65 but is within the ownership of no. 63.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND LIST OF POLICIES

Planning legislation holds that the determination of a planning application shall be made in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Using this as the starting point the development plan for this part of Mid Sussex consists of the District Plan, Site Allocation Development Plan Document (DPD) and the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan.

National policy (which is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy Guidance) does not form part of the development plan, but is an important material consideration.

Mid Sussex District Plan

The District Plan was adopted at Full Council on 28th March 2018.

Relevant policies:

DP34 Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets.

Site Allocations DPD

The SADPD was adopted on 29th June 2022. It allocates sufficient housing and employment land to meet identified needs to 2031.

There are no relevant policies.

Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan

No relevant policies.

Other Material Considerations

Mid Sussex District Plan 2021-2039 Consultation Draft

The District Council is reviewing and updating the District Plan. Upon adoption, the new District Plan 2021 - 2039 will replace the current District Plan 2014-2031 and its policies will have full weight. In accordance with the NPPF, Local Planning Authorities may give weight to relevant policies of the emerging plan according to the stage of preparation; the extent to which there are unresolved objections to the relevant policies; and the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the NPPF. The draft District Plan 2021-2039 (Regulation 19) 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 policies:

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 2023)

Paragraphs 210-215 of the NPPF are relevant and state that:

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

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

211. In considering any applications to remove or alter a historic statue, plaque, memorial or monument (whether listed or not), local planning authorities should have regard to the importance of their retention in situ and, where appropriate, of explaining their historic and social context rather than removal.

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.'

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

'In considering whether to grant listed building consent for any works the local planning authority or the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.'

ASSESSMENT

District Plan Policy DP34 is relevant, and states, in part, that:

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

- Alterations or extensions to a listed building respect its historic form, scale, setting, significance and fabric...'

The current proposal, which has been amended on Officer advice, is for the reconstruction and extension of the existing brick wall enclosing the rear yard to the property. The works will extend the wall to enclose an area which lies to the rear of the neighbouring building at no. 65 but is within the ownership of no. 63. The proposal has been amended so that the height of the wall will step down as it approaches the rear elevation of no. 65 to ensure that existing exposed timber within the elevation remains exposed to view. The wall also stops short of the elevation, with timber trellis to fill the gap, so that there will be no attachment to or physical impact on the historic fabric of the building.

The existing wall is not of any particular age or architectural interest, but attaches at one end to the rear of Wyncote. It is not in good structural condition, and requires repair. In this context, the principle of rebuilding it is not considered contentious. The proposed extension to the wall will enclose a small area to the rear of no. 65 which is within the ownership of no. 63. As revised however, the form of the wall should allow the most significant feature of this wall (the exposed timber) to remain appreciable from the rear yard to no. 65. The manner in which the wall will be set off the rear elevation of the building also ensures no adverse impact on the historic fabric of the building.

The wall is to be constructed in Sussex clay Lambs bricks with lime mortar, in a style to match existing.

On this basis, the proposal is considered to preserve the setting and special interest of the listed building at 63-65 High Street, meeting the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

It is recommended that listed building consent is granted.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Emily Wade