

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/1058	Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent		
Proposal:	External repairs and alterations to openings and internal layout to outbuilding within curtilage of Tanyard Manor		
Site:	Tanyard Manor, Horsted Lane, Sharpthorne, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 4HY, ,		
Validation Date	28 Apr 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	12 Jun 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Refusal	Recommendation Date:	23 Jun 2026
Target Date:	23 Jun 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Stefan Galyas</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Steven King</i>	Date:	23 Jun 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/1058

**Tanyard Manor, Horsted Lane, Sharpthorne, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 4HY,
External repairs and alterations to openings and internal layout to outbuilding within curtilage of
Tanyard Manor
Mr And Mrs Hagan**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

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

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Conservation Officer: *'In summary, although some aspects of the proposal are not considered contentious, other aspects including in particular the works internally to the stable block to remove partitions, the proposed new and altered rooflights, and the method of insulation to the roof of the stable block, are considered to result in a degree of less than substantial harm to the special interest of the curtilage listed building, and via setting to the special interest of Tanyard Manor. I would place this harm at low-mid in relation to the outbuilding itself, and low in relation to the Manor. The balancing exercise set out in paragraph 215 of the NPPF would therefore apply.'*

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Parish Council: No comment.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks listed building consent for external repairs and alterations to openings together with internal reconfiguration of the building to provide residential accommodation including multiple bedrooms, bathroom facilities and associated living space.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

03/01209/LBC- Reconstruction following fire damage of converted barn building with additional height on external walls with original roof pitch to form house keeper living accommodation. Permission.

03/01209/FUL- Reconstruction following fire damage of converted barn building with additional height on external walls with original roof pitch to form house keeper living accommodation. Permission.

11/00672/FUL- New crossover entrance and driveway, and closure of existing entrance driveway.
Withdrawn.

11/02312/FUL- New crossover entrance and closure of existing entrance. Permission.

DM/20/1068- Conversion of agricultural buildings to form three bedroom dwelling. Permission.

DM/20/1518- Conversion of Agricultural Buildings to form Single Dwelling. Permission.

DM/25/0915- Internal alterations to include structural alterations to kitchen, new doors and rooflights, new partitions and alterations to the layout at ground and second floors, and external landscaping.
Permission.

DM/25/2412 - Proposed renewal of tile hanging and associated timber accents. Permission.

DM/25/2009 - Proposed stripping and renewal of roof finishes to comprise new insulation and roof membrane, installation of bat features (boxes, arches and roost features), and repairs to chimneys to include reinstating pots. Permission.

DM/25/2984 - Proposed alterations to the driveway surfacing and external landscaping to the pool area. Permission 16.02.2026.

DM/25/2985 - Proposal within the curtilage of the listed building (Tanyard Manor) for external repairs and internal alterations to western outbuilding. As well as alterations to driveway surfacing and external landscaping of pool area. Withdrawn.

DM/26/1057 - External repairs and alterations to openings and internal layout to outbuilding within curtilage of Tanyard Manor. Pending consideration.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Tanyard Manor is a three-storey grade II Listed detached property of timber frame construction. The property benefits from extensive gardens, a gravelled parking area to the front of the property, and a tennis court to the south of the site. To the northwest of the site are a number of outbuildings, including a coach house.

The property lies outside the built-up area boundary of Horsted Keynes. A tributary of the River Ouse lies to the east of the application site. Neighbouring properties are located to the north and south, whilst open countryside lies to the east. Highway is located to the west.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposed development would carry out various exterior alterations which includes to addition of rooflights to the buildings eastern, western and northern roof slopes. The proposed skylights would be conservation units. The proposal would also demolish the existing 1950s lean to WC. A new swift box would also be positioned within the buildings northern projecting gable. A new window would also be installed to the eastern elevation to the 1950s extension. The window would be white painted timber.

Further repairs would be carried out to the existing stable doors. The clay roof tiles and black-stained timber weatherboarding to the C19th stables and mid 20th-century eastern extension would be replaced with matching materials.

The description of development also notes that further alterations would be carried out to the internal layout of the building. This would include residential accommodation including multiple bedrooms, bathroom facilities and associated living space.

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 Horsted Keynes 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:

DP26: Character and Design

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

Policy HK4 Maintaining Local Character and Good Quality Design

Policy HK6 Conserving Local Heritage

Other Legislation

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 16(2) - 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.

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 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:

DPB1 - Character and Design

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)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 is a material consideration. Paragraphs 2, 8, 11, 39, 48, 131, 135, 139, 207, 208, 209, 212-215, 219 & 220.

ASSESSMENT

It is considered that the main issues that need to be considered in the determination of this application are as follows;

- Impact on Heritage Assets and Character and Design

Impact on Heritage Assets and Character and Design

With regard to the setting of the listed building, policy DP34 requires:

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

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

Paragraph 207 of the NPPF requires the applicant to describe the significance of any heritage asset affected. Significance is defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF as *'The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting.'* The applicant has provided a Heritage Statement in support of the application which assesses the proposals impact on the relevant heritage assets. Therefore, this requirement of the NPPF is considered to have been met.

Paragraph 208 of the NPPF requires the Local Planning Authority to identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected and take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal.

The NPPF states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Paragraphs 212 - 215 of the NPPF states:

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

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

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;*
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.*

214. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and*
- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and*
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.*

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

Policy DP26 of the District Plan states:

'All development and surrounding spaces, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings and replacement dwellings, will be well designed and reflect the distinctive character of the towns and villages while being sensitive to the countryside. All applicants will be required to demonstrate that development:

- o is of high quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace;*
- o contributes positively to, and clearly defines, public and private realms and should normally be designed with active building frontages facing streets and public open spaces to animate and provide natural surveillance;*
- o creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape;*
- o protects open spaces, trees and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;*
- o does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings, including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight, and noise, air and light pollution'*

The Horsted Keynes Neighbourhood Plan states under Policy HK4 that:

'All development should maintain the distinct local character and demonstrate good quality design. This means recognising the significance of the village setting, responding to it, and integrating with local surroundings and landscape context as well as the existing built environment and in particular:

- o achieving high quality design that respects the scale, bulk and character of existing and surrounding buildings; and*
- o ensuring proposals relate to established plot widths within streets where development is proposed, particularly where they establish a rhythm to the architecture in a street; and*
- o using good quality materials that complement the existing palette of materials used within Horsted Keynes; and*
- o demonstrating where possible innovation to achieve low carbon sustainable design (as per policy HK11); and*
- o adopting the principles of sustainable urban drainage, where applicable (as per policy HK12); and*
- o respecting the natural contours of the site and protecting and sensitively incorporating well-established natural features of the landscape including trees, species-rich hedgerows and ponds within the site; and*
- o providing sufficient external amenity space, refuse and recycling storage and car and bicycle parking to ensure a high quality and well managed streetscape.'*

Policy HK6 of the Horsted Keynes Neighbourhood Plan requires development proposals to preserve or enhance the special architectural or historic interest of listed buildings and their setting.

The below assessment is made whilst being mindful of this guidance and having regard to the statutory duty of the Council, as the Local Planning Authority, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting in accordance with the requirements of Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

External Works

In relation to the proposed external works to the building, it was considered by the Council's Conservation Officer that whilst the removal of the 20th century link between the stable block and WC wasn't considered contentious, the volume of the proposed rooflights was deemed as being excessive. Concern was raised with regard to the new, repositioned and enlarged rooflights' resulting in a loss of historic fabric from the structure of the building.

No further concerns were raised with regard to the proposed re-roofing and other external alterations. Subject to further detail, this element of the proposal would likely aid in the upkeep and maintenance of the curtilage listed building. The Conservation Officer's comments throughout are agreed with by the Case Officer in this instance.

Internal Works

Further works would be carried out internally at ground floor level including alterations to; the flooring within the open fronted garage, the conversion of the kitchen into a sitting room and the removal of a number of stall partitions within the stable wing. Further internal alterations would be carried out at first floor level including changes to the plan format.

The Conservation Officer noted that some of the proposed internal works would result in a degree of harm. The removal of the stall partitions within the stable wing was considered to result in a negative impact on the manner which the intended purpose that the building could be read. Furthermore, the alteration to the existing door opening to allow for the repositioning of the door into the end bay was considered to be unjustified, with other potentially less harmful options available.

The proposal to insulate between and below the historic rafters of the stable was not considered to be appropriate by the Conservation Officer. The addition of aesthetic rafters beneath could obscure views to appreciate the historic roof construction form and this element of the proposal was not considered to be appropriate.

In light of the above, a degree of less than substantial harm was identified and placed at low-mid in relation to the outbuilding itself and low in relation to the Manor building.

Where the harm would be less than substantial, in terms of the NPPF, the criteria set out in paragraph 215 of that document 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 proposed development may create some local employment during the construction phase of the development. However, given the scale of the proposed works, this benefit is considered to attribute limited weight. The use of further internal insulation may reduce the energy demands of the building and improve its thermal efficiency. Otherwise, the proposed is not considered to yield any further discernible public benefits.

Overall, it is considered that the scale of volume of the proposed rooflights would result in less than substantial harm towards the identified heritage assets. This would result in an unacceptable loss of historic fabric from the curtilage listed building. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policies DP26 and DP34 of the District Plan, Policies HK4 and HK6 of the Horsted Keynes Neighbourhood Plan, Paragraph 215 of the NPPF and Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

The proposed development would result in less than substantial harm towards the identified heritage assets through an unacceptable increase in the volume of rooflights and the unacceptable and in part unjustified loss of internal historic fabric. This loss of historic fabric and the level of harm would not be outweighed sufficiently by public benefits.

It is therefore considered that the proposed development would conflict with the provisions of policies DP26 and DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policies HK4 and HK6 of the Horsted Keynes Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Decision: Refusal

Case Officer: Stefan Galyas