

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/0455	Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent		
Proposal:	Proposed replacement extension to create new kitchen.		
Site:	Shepherds Farm, Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 4HQ, ,		
Validation Date	20 Feb 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	28 Mar 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	15 Apr 2025
Target Date:	17 Apr 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Stefan Galyas</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	16 Apr 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/0455

**Shepherds Farm, Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 4HQ,
Proposed replacement extension to create new kitchen.
Mr And Mrs Corfe**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

There were no letters of representation received in response to the current proposal.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Conservation Officer:

The application site, Shepherds Farm, is a Grade II listed former farmhouse located in a semi-rural position outside Crawley Down. The building has a somewhat complex history, which belies the date given in the list description- internal inspection reveals a timber framed core orientated east-west and possibly dating (according to the submitted heritage statement) to the 15th or 16th centuries. Historical map regression and the external appearance of the house suggest that this east-west range was extended to the south in the early 19th century, and refronted, creating the superficially early 19th century building fronting onto Turners Hill Road which characterises the house today. Various other alterations have been made to the building over time, including a mid 20th century rear wing extending to the north east which is the subject of the current proposals. The former farmstead to the farm, now a residential conversion in separate ownership, survives just to the east of the house.

The current proposal is for the demolition and rebuild on an enlarged footprint of the existing single storey north east addition to create a larger space for a kitchen- the existing kitchen elsewhere in the house would then be repurposed as a study.

The existing addition, as above, appears to date from the mid 20th century and is not of any particular historical or architectural interest. Its demolition is therefore not considered contentious in principle. The existing addition has an L shaped plan, tucked into the north east corner of the building- the proposal would be to remove the western elevation and the north facing wall linking this to the earlier house, and to bring the building line of the addition further to the west, abutting but not overlapping the earlier fabric. The roof form of the extension would also be altered from a pitched to a hipped roof with a slightly higher ridge line. Alterations to the remaining elevations of the addition are also proposed including re-siting the rear entrance to the house.

The proposals will result in an increase in bulk and height to the extension. In other circumstances, where a building has already received several additions over time, the cumulative impact of such additions may be considered such that any further extension will result in an unacceptable relationship of scale between the historic core of the building and the additions to. In this instance, however, the special interest of the building lies partly in the later layers of its development, such that the significance of the building will be considered to lie not only in the original timber framed house at its heart, but also the later 19th century additions and remodelling. Viewed in this light, the proposed enlarged extension is considered on balance to remain subservient to the core of the host building. The principle of the proposal is therefore considered acceptable.

The detailed design of the addition, which reflects the rural vernacular, relates sympathetically to the context- arguably more so than the extension in its existing form. Subject to detail, this aspect of the proposal is not considered contentious.

Naturespace District Licensing:

No objection.

Southern Water:

Southern water has that a Build Over application is to be submitted to Southern Water for approval.

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Parish Council: Defer to officer.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks listed building consent for the demolition of the existing single storey extension and replacement with a single storey extension in its place.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/22/2640 - Erection of acoustic boundary fence along Turners Hill Road. Refusal 18.11.22

DM/23/1681 - Replacement of secondary glazing, new secondary glazing and regularisation of a new external boiler and cover. Permission 21.08.23

DM/23/1680 - Replacement of secondary glazing, new secondary glazing and regularisation of a new external boiler and cover. Permission 21.08.23

DM/23/2873 - Erection of new 2m high close boarded timber fence set back 3.5m from the boundary line with Turners Hill Road (B2028). Permission 15.03.24

DM/24/1504 - Replacement of 14 windows and refurbishment of 4 existing windows. Permission 09.08.24

DM/24/1505 - Replacement of 14 windows and refurbishment of 4 existing windows. Permission 09.08.24

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application relates to Shepherds Farm, a grade II listed property set to the eastern side of Turners Hill Road. The existing building features rendered walls, red roof tiles, timber sash and casement windows and timber doors. The building is listed under the following description:

2. Early C19. Two storeys. Three winow. Painted brick. Ripped tiled roof. Glazing bars missing. Two bays on ground floor. Trellised porch with later gable.

The site is located outside of any built-up area boundary as in therefore considered to be set within the open countryside for planning purposes.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The existing single storey eastern elevation extension would be demolished with a replacement single storey extension in its place. The proposal would measure at approximately 9.8m in length, 5.8m wide, have an eaves height of 2.3m and a ridge height measuring at 4.6m. Proposed external materials would comprise facing brickwork exterior walls, red roof tiles, timber sash and casement windows and the re-use of the existing door.

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 Crawley Down 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

Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan (Made January 2016)

Relevant Policies

Policy CDNP04.1: Building Extensions

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) was published for public consultation on 12th January 2024 for six weeks and as a result of this consultation there are unresolved objections to some of the Policies in the draft District Plan. 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:

DPS1 - Climate Change

DPS2 - Sustainable Design and Construction

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, DP34 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. 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 listed building is considered to be significant in heritage terms by virtue of its designation and this significance is likely to arise from its historical, aesthetic (fortuitous) value and historical (illustrative) value.

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.'

DP26 of the District Plan states, in part:

'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'*

Policy CDNP04.1 of the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan notes:

'Building extensions will be permitted provided they are in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan and meet the following criteria:

- a) The scale, height, and form of the extension should be subservient to the existing building, and should be in character with the street scene. Where appropriate, special regard should be had to sustaining and enhancing the setting and features of heritage assets and the Areas of Townscape Character.*
- b) The traditional boundary treatment of an area is retained and where feasible reinforced.*
- c) Suitable access and on-site parking is provided without detriment to neighbouring properties.*

- d) Amenities such as access, noise, privacy, daylight, sunlight and outlook of adjoining residents are safeguarded.
- e) Gaps which provide views out of the village to surrounding countryside are maintained.
- f) Materials are compatible with materials of existing/surrounding buildings.'

Principle DG49 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide states:

'Extensions should typically use simple, uncomplicated building forms to compliment 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.'

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.

The proposal would be contained to the east of the main and more historic wing of the house and would replace what appears to be a mid 20th century extension. It was commented by the Conservation Officer that this existing eastern element was not of any particular historic nor architectural merit. As such, its demolition was considered to be acceptable in principle. It was also commented that the whole dwelling has evolved through numerous alterations over time with an original east-west core. It was noted that the buildings special interest can be partly derived from the later layers of its development.

The proposed extension would be contained wholly to a single storey level and would utilise a hipped roof pitch with rooflights placed to a number of different pitches. Furthermore, the proposal would use a wider layout form but would still project out at the same length in a northward's direction. Due to the new roof form and larger footprint, a higher ridge height would be used. This would likely increase the offshoots overall bulk and height however it is considered that the extensions would on the whole remain subservient towards the existing. As such, it is considered that the proposal would result in an acceptable impact on the whole.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to preserve the special interest of the listed building. The proposal would not significantly remove nor alter the existing historic fabric and as such would comply with the provisions of Policies DP26 and DP34 of the District Plan, Policy CDNP04.1 Neighbourhood Plan and the statutory duties as set out within the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

To summarise, it is considered that the proposals will have an acceptable impact on the listed building, the character and appearance of the area and neighbouring amenities. As such, the application complies with Policies DP26 and DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policy CDP04.1 of the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan, the Mid Sussex Design Guide, Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) act and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Stefan Galyas