

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/2999	Case Officer:	Katherine Williams
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent		
Proposal:	Construction of rear single-storey extension, external and internal alterations, general repair and conservation works to main house. Demolition of existing outbuilding and construction of replacement carport building.		
Site:	West House Farm, Henfield Road, Albourne, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9DE, ,		
Validation Date	21 Nov 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	26 Dec 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	4 Mar 2026
Target Date:	16 Jan 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Katherine Williams

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	4 Mar 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/2999

**West House Farm, Henfield Road, Albourne, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9DE,
Construction of rear single-storey extension, external and internal alterations, general repair and conservation works to main house. Demolition of existing outbuilding and construction of replacement carport building.
Mr Edward Owens**

LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION

None received

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

MSDC Conservation Officer - No objection following amendments, recommends conditions

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Albourne Parish Council has no objections to this application, but the listed tree which is proposed for felling should be replaced if the felling is approved.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks listed building consent for the construction of rear single-storey extension, external and internal alterations, general repair and conservation works to main house. Demolition of existing outbuilding and construction of replacement carport building.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/25/2998 - Construction of rear single-storey extension, external and internal alterations, general repair and conservation works to main house. Demolition of existing outbuilding and construction of replacement carport building.. Under Consideration

DM/25/3028 - Proposed demolition of modern farm buildings. Extension and conversion of existing barn to dwelling house. Conversion of existing stable building to ancillary accommodation. Construction of replacement stables, games room outbuilding, and a bike, bin and storage outbuilding'. Under Consideration

DM/25/3040 - Proposed demolition of modern farm buildings. Extension and conversion of existing barn to dwelling house. Conversion of existing stable building to ancillary accommodation. Construction of replacement stables, games room outbuilding, and a bike, bin and storage outbuilding'. Under Consideration

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application property is located off the western side of Henfield Road, within the countryside, and is accessed by an extended private driveway.

The property consists of a detached two storey dwelling positioned to the north-west corner of the curtilage of the property. The dwelling is Grade II listed and dates back to the late 18th early 19th century and consists of a brick-built farmhouse. The driveway continues along the northern side of the dwelling leading to a collection of barns and equestrian buildings and facilities. The main barn is a 18th century Grade II listed weather boarded barn with open barns on either side and enclosed paddock to the rear.

There are a number of footpaths within the locality which provides public views of the proposal, including a footpath that runs parallel with the access drive from Henfield Road, crosses the driveway and extends along the northern boundary of the site and then along the northern side of the haybarns at the far west of the site.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposed single storey rear extension would have a width and depth of some 5.7 metres and 5 metres and would be connected to the existing single storey project and rear elevation of the main dwelling. This extension would have a flat roof with a perimeter parapet with an overall height of some 3 metres.

The proposal includes a number of internal alteration including removal of the internal subdividing walls to existing rear projection, inclusion of W.C. in existing kitchen, subdivision of first floor bathroom to create an ensuite bathroom and separate bathroom, and replacement of ground floor window on the northern elevation to a door and window.

The proposal also includes the replacement of the existing outbuilding to the rear of the dwelling with a double carport, which would have a width and depth of some 6.5 metres and 6.3 metres, with a pitched hipped roof with an overall height and eaves height of approximately 4.8 metres and 2.5 metres.

LIST OF POLICIES

DISTRICT PLAN (adopted 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.

Albourne Neighbourhood Plan (made September 2016)

None relevant

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 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 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 provided the following comments on the application:

'West House Farm is a historic farmstead located in a rural position outside Albourne. The farmstead includes a Grade II listed farmhouse, which dates originally from the late 17th- early 18th century, with a second parallel range and rear wing added in the late 17th/early 19th century, a Grade II listed weatherboarded barn of the mid-late 17th century, and a number of other ancillary buildings which are predominantly ranged around a series of yards to the south-west of the house. These include a late 18th century stable which would be regarded as curtilage listed. The farmstead is recorded in the West Sussex Historic Farmstead and Landscape Character Assessment as a historic farmstead of the post-Medieval period.

...

Based on the revised information contained within the Heritage Statement accompanying the application I now have concerns regarding the loss of historic fabric from the south elevation of the late 18th/early

19th century rear wing, in particular the potential impact on the elongated ventilation windows, which are an important evidentiary feature relating to the wing's original use. The Heritage Statement suggests that ribs and a downstand would be retained, but it was not clear if the downstand would include the windows- this seems unlikely given the levels involved. I would like to see a sectional detail at this stage to demonstrate the relationship of the addition with the existing building, so that the impact on the fabric of the structure including these windows is fully understood.

Also externally it is proposed to replace a window to the north elevation of the house with a door and sidelight. Although some loss of late 18th/early 19th century fabric will be involved, it is suggested that this part of the elevation has been previously altered, and the window itself is uPVC. In the context of the more sympathetic design and materials of the door and side window now proposed the aspect of the proposal is considered on balance acceptable.

Additional external works include removal of cementitious pointing with lime-based mortar, with replacement of damaged bricks on a like-for-like basis, replacement of the roof covering, and repairs and repointing of chimney stacks. Subject to detail which could be reserved by condition these works constitute beneficial repair of the listed building.

It is also proposed to replace modern uPVC windows to the house with painted timber casements incorporating slimline double glazing. Surviving historic casements are to be retained and repaired, and the detailing matched in the replacement windows. This aspect of the proposal is also considered beneficial to the special interest of the building, subject to detail which could be reserved by condition.

Internally, works are proposed at both levels of the farmhouse, and within the rear wing. To the house itself, at ground floor it is proposed to create a WC within the main room to the late 18th/early 19th century range, by insertion of partitioning and opening up of a doorway into the hall. Although this will have some impact on plan form and fabric it is a relatively minor intervention and is on balance considered acceptable.

At first floor, concerns were raised at pre-application stage regarding the level of intervention proposed arising from provision of ensuite bathrooms. As submitted, within bedroom two to the rear range an ensuite is retained, and although the size of this has been reduced it is now combined with adjacent built-in storage, so that the impact on the floor plan and fabric of the room concerned is if anything greater than previously shown. Within the earlier front range, the proposal has been amended to remove one new opening previously proposed between bedroom 3 and its ensuite. However, the subdivision of the central room remains as previously shown. The impact on the floor plan and fabric of the front range remains in my opinion unacceptable. Built in storage is also shown to the two bedrooms within the 17th century range of the house- this would represent a further unjustified impact on the room plan and fabric and should be omitted in favour of free-standing wardrobes (this also applies to bedroom 4). This aspect of the proposal requires further reconsideration- I would reiterate that the provision of this number of ensuite bathrooms within a listed building of this relatively modest scale is likely to prove over ambitious.

Also, internally to the house it is proposed to remove modern gypsum and cement-based finishes to walls and ceilings, retaining and repairing historic fabric where it is found, and introducing breathable lime finishes where modern work is removed. Subject to detail this work is considered beneficial to the special interest of the building.

Within the rear wing it is proposed to remove modern partitioning, opening the space up into what is assumed to be its original volume. This is not considered contentious. In light of our better understanding of the original use of the wing and the key surviving features which contribute to an understanding of this I would however like to receive further detail of the proposal in respect of both the roof/roof timbers internally, and of the flooring, to ensure that these significant elements are appropriately treated. This further detail should include any works considered necessary for the introduction or upgrading of insulation to the walls, floor and roof.

Within the setting of the house, it is proposed to demolish an existing modern outbuilding and construct a double car port. The existing building is not of special architectural or historical interest and makes at best a neutral contribution to the settings of the farmhouse and historic farmstead. Its loss is not considered contentious. The proposed replacement car port is larger than the building to be removed

and set slightly forward of it, so that it will be more visually prominent in views of the farmhouse from the adjacent entrance driveway. It is however of an appropriate form and design, and subject to detail which could be reserved by condition is not considered to detract from the settings or significances of the adjacent heritage assets.

The proposal also includes a slight widening of the entrance track adjacent to the house and creation of a further car parking space adjacent to the car port. Subject to detail, this aspect of the proposal is not considered contentious. New hard surfacing should be sympathetic to the rural nature of the context- this also applies to any work which may be envisaged to the length of the entrance driveway to the northeast of the house, which is not currently in good condition in some areas. Upgrading of the drive does not appear to be part of the application, but the nature of any work including materials should be carefully considered in terms of the impact on the setting of the farmstead. It would be helpful if the applicant could confirm their intentions in this respect.

In summary, although the proposal has been revised following pre-application and is in some respects acceptable, even beneficial in terms of the impact on the special interest of the listed building, other aspects raise concerns in terms of the impact on the plan form or fabric of the building. Further information and/or revision of the proposal is required to address these concerns, to ensure that the special interest of the building is preserved, in order to meet the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.'

Following these comments amended plans have been provided which includes the removal of the first floor built in storage, an ensuite bathroom, permeable materials and plaster to the single storey extension along with further information regarding other concerns raised. These details, along with further details submitted regarding works to the existing driveway, are considered acceptable by the Conservation Officer subject to conditions.

The proposed alterations and extension to the dwellinghouse and the proposed garage building are considered to be of a size, form and design that would in proportion and appropriate to the character and appearance of the building. The proposal would respect the significance and special interest of the listed building and its setting as well as retaining the rural character of the area.

Officers therefore agree with the comment made by the Conservation Officer and subject to suitable conditions, the proposal would not have harmful impact on the special interest of the listed building.

CONCLUSION

The special interest of the building will therefore not be harmed by the works. As a result, the proposal complies with policy DP34 of the District Plan, as well as the requirements of both the NPPF and the Listed Building and Conservation Area (LBCA) Act 1990.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Katherine Williams