

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/0405	Case Officer:	Emily Wade
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent		
Proposal:	Proposed three conservation rooflights, (amended design to previous application DM/24/2872).		
Site:	The White Harte Inn, South Street, Cuckfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5LB, ,		
Validation Date	17 Feb 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	21 Mar 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	3 Apr 2025
Target Date:	14 Apr 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	Emily Wade

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	1
--	--	-------------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	16 Apr 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/0405

**The White Harte Inn, South Street, Cuckfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5LB,
Proposed three conservation rooflights, (amended design to previous application DM/24/2872).
Mr Kevin Smith**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Not relevant.

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No comment - Committee agreed to defer to the knowledge of the heritage officer.

INTRODUCTION

The White Harte Inn is a Grade II listed building located in a prominent position within the Cuckfield Conservation Area. The current proposal, which is a revision of a previously refused scheme, is for the installation of three conservation rooflights to the rear slope of the building.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/24/2872 Listed building consent refused for the installation of three rooflights to the rear roofslope.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The White Harte Inn is a Grade II listed building located in a prominent position within the Cuckfield Conservation Area. The building dates originally from the 17th century with later alterations and extensions, particularly during the 19th century. There are a number of other listed buildings within the vicinity, including The Friary to the north and Chantry Cottage to the south west, both Grade II listed and also fronting onto South Street, and to the rear Grade I listed Holy Trinity Church, with associated Grade II listed lych gates and tombs, and a Grade II listed school building.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The current proposal is for the installation of three conservation style rooflights to the rear roofslope of the building.

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 Cuckfield 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.

Neighbourhood Plan

Policy CNP1 - Design of New Development and Conservation.

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 will be relevant, and states 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 is for the installation of three rooflights to the rear roofslope of the building. This follows on from the refusal of listed building consent for a similar proposal on grounds of harm to the special interest of the listed building, specifically loss of historic fabric arising from the insertion of the windows. The proposal has been amended to amend the position and reduce the size of two of the rooflights so that they sit between the original rafters, rather than requiring these to be cut. The third rooflight is retained at a slightly larger size, but would be sited where there is an already damaged rafter. Although there would be some further loss of fabric from this timber, it would be relatively minor. On balance, this is considered to be acceptable. The impact on the external appearance of the building is also not considered to be contentious.

The proposal is therefore considered to preserve the special interest of the listed building, 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