

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/0781	Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent		
Proposal:	Proposed two storey rear extension. Existing store room removed. New internal soil vent stack. Roof replaced and repaired. New doors and some windows removed. New outdoor steps, raised timber decking with glass balustrade. Various internal alterations and associated landscaping		
Site:	Red House Farm, Cowfold Road, Bolney, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5SG, ,		
Validation Date	16 Apr 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	9 Mar 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Refusal	Recommendation Date:	5 May 2026
Target Date:	11 Jun 2025	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:	5 May 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/0781

Red House Farm, Cowfold Road, Bolney, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5SG,
Proposed two storey rear extension. Existing store room removed. New internal soil vent stack.
Roof replaced and repaired. New doors and some windows removed. New outdoor steps, raised
timber decking with glass balustrade. Various internal alterations and associated landscaping
Mr James Hicks

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

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

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Conservation Officer: *'In summary, in my opinion the principle of a two-storey extension remains unacceptable, and despite the reduction in bulk of the proposed addition it remains over scaled and inappropriately dominant in the context of the original modestly sized house.'*

Although I have read and considered the arguments made within the heritage response received, in my opinion the heritage benefit arising from some of the proposed internal alterations to the building does not outweigh the harm caused by the extension to it, particularly as some of these benefits could be achieved by a single storey addition similar to that for which approval has been previously granted. I also do not accept that the proposed work is necessary to achieve the optimum viable use of the building- there is no evidence before us to suggest that the extension is necessary for the ongoing residential occupation of the house, particularly given that a single storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation at ground floor level has been granted consent.

In addition, the further information does not address previously expressed concerns regarding the potential loss of historic fabric from the first-floor rear elevation of the building resulting from the extension- there is no new information provided in terms of the date or level of interest of this fabric.

Furthermore, the proposal with respect to the 19th century outshot at the rear of the building remains the same, resulting in a loss of legibility and harm to this aspect of the building's narrative.

Lastly, no further information regarding the proposed roof repair works has been provided- the detail available in respect of this aspect of the scheme therefore remains insufficient.

In my opinion, therefore the proposal remains unacceptable for reasons of the scale, bulk and form of the proposed two storey rear addition, of potential associated loss of historic fabric from the first-floor rear of the building, and of adverse impact on the legibility of the 19th century rear outshot. In addition, insufficient information has been provided in relation to the proposed repair works to the roof of the house. For these reasons, the proposal remains contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34, and will result in less than substantial harm to the special interest of the listed building, at around the midpoint of that scale. The balancing exercise set out in paragraph 215 of the NPPF will therefore apply. In carrying out this exercise, the Council should be mindful of the requirement under paragraph 212 to give great weight to the conservation of heritage assets, and of that under paragraph 213 that any harm to a designated asset should require clear and convincing justification.'

Southern Water: No objection.

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Parish Council: *'No objection subject to the support of the MSDC Conservation Officer for the proposals.'*

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks listed building consent for the development of a rear elevation two storey extension, the existing door to the larder to be removed and bricked up, roof repairs, new doors and some windows removed, new outdoor steps and a glass balustrade to border a proposed outdoor terrace.

Internally, the proposal would make alterations to the existing wall partitioning, creating new doorways and new walls within.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

11/01713/LBC - Remove hung tiles to front of house (east elevation) and fit insulation. Treat oak frame, felt and replace batten and re-hang removed tiles using second hand stock to replace defective ones. Dismantle defective and unsafe chimney stack to south elevation and re-build straight using re-claimed bricks. Permission 12.08.2011.

DM/22/1847 - Proposed single storey rear extension to provide a new kitchen and alterations to existing kitchen to create shower room together with alterations on first floor to fit a bathroom within existing small bedroom. Permission 08.08.2022.

DM/22/1848 - Proposed single storey rear extension to provide a new kitchen and alterations to existing kitchen to create shower room together with alterations on first floor to fit a bathroom within existing small bedroom. Permission 08.08.2022.

DM/25/0780 - Proposed two storey rear extension. Existing store room removed. New internal soil vent stack. Roof replaced and repaired. New doors and some windows removed. New outdoor steps, raised timber decking with glass balustrade. Various internal alterations and associated landscaping. Pending consideration.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application relates to Red House Farm, a detached grade II listed property which is set to the western side of the highway and accessed through a gravelled track which curves around from west to north. The building is listed under the following description:

'C17 or earlier. Two storeys. Four windows. Tile-hung. Tiled roof with pentice on south side. Casement windows.'

The site is not located within any designated settlement boundary and is set within an amber Great Crested Newt impact risk zone.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The application seeks listed building consent for the development of a two storey rear extension which would measure at 5.3m in maximum depth, 4.8m wide, 4.3m high to the eaves and 6.9m high to the ridge when taken from the highest point of the adjacent natural ground floor level. Proposed external materials would comprise brick and timber frame walls clad in clay tile hanging at first floor level and clay roof tiles.

The proposal would also construct a new raised timber decking and a paving to the western side of the dwelling. The proposal would also repair the existing dwellings roof with clay roof tiles.

The proposal would also remove part of the existing stud partition walls to create new doorways as well as creating new internal wall partitions.

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 Bolney 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

Relevant Policies:

Bolney Neighbourhood Plan (Made September 2016)

Policy BOLD1 - Design of New Development and Conservation

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 impact on 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 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 state:

'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.'

Policy BOLD1 of the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan states that:

'Planning permission for new development will ordinarily be permitted subject to the following criteria: It is designed to a high quality which reflects Bolney's rural nature and responds to the heritage and distinctive character by way of; height, scale, spacing, layout, orientation, design and materials of buildings, and

the scale, design and materials of the public realm (highways, footways, open space and landscape); and

It does not have an unacceptable impact on the setting of any heritage asset; and

It respects the natural contours of a site and protects and sensitively incorporates well-established natural features of the landscape including trees, species-rich hedgerows and ponds within the site; and It creates a safe, accessible and well-connected environment that meets the needs of its users; and It will not result in unacceptable levels of light, noise, air or water pollution, and

Where possible, it provides lock-up facilities for storage of bicycles, children's pushchairs and mobility vehicles to encourage walking and cycling and to assist accessibility.'

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 proposed development would develop a two-storey rear (west) extension and would intersect the existing roof. The proposal would utilise a hipped roof design as well as a hipped dormer to the western elevation. The existing dwelling is considered to be of a modest overall size and scale which is commonly associated with more traditional style buildings and is considered to give rise to a cottage style appearance. With the addition of the proposed two storey extension, the proposal would likely appear substantial in both footprint and in overall size, scale and massing. When compared to the adjacent outshots and cat slide roof on the existing dwelling, the proposed extension would likely appear as out of sorts, resulting in an awkward and disjointed relationship.

Further external alterations would include the blocking up of the existing store doorway as part of the alterations to create a larder to the west elevation. Following a consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer, it was concluded that this alteration would erode the legibility of the previous historic extensions over time to the building. It is therefore considered that such works would not result in an acceptable impact towards the listed building.

It was noted within the consultation with the Council's Conservation Officer that the proposed internal alterations would mainly affect the more modern fabric of the listed building. The alterations to create a bathroom would in turn reduce the size of the existing bedroom. Whilst this was identified as being moderately contentious by the Conservation Officer but was found to be acceptable when balanced against the proposed benefits in reinstating of the original bay through the relocation of the southern bedroom wall and removal of existing partitioning.

It was also considered by the Council's Conservation Officer that the submitted supporting information does not provide a sufficient justification for the loss of the historic fabric from the first-floor rear elevation of the building. No information has been provided regarding the date or level of historic interest to this element. It was also noted that insufficient information has been provided regarding the proposed roof repair works.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to result in less than substantial harm at the midway point of the scale towards the Listed Building through introducing an overly large feature as well as eroding the existing historic fabric. Paragraph 215 of the NPPF requires that the Local Planning Authority weigh any harm inflicted against the public benefits which would be achieved. The construction phase of the development would likely provide some economic benefit through local trade, however it is considered that limited weight can only be attributed given the domestic scale of the works. The Applicant claims that the proposed works are necessary towards the optimal viable use of the building, however there is no evidence showing this is necessary towards the continued residential occupation of the dwelling. Otherwise, it is not considered that there would be any further discernible public benefits. As such, the public benefits are not considered to outweigh the less than substantial harm.

It is therefore concluded that the proposed development would be unacceptable in terms of the overall size, scale and massing of the extension as well as eroding the historic fabric of the building. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal would inflict less than substantial harm towards the listed building, around the midpoint of the scale when assessing harm. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the requirements of policy DP34 of the District Plan, Policy BOLD1 of the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan, the Mid Sussex Design Guide, the National Design Guide and Paragraphs 135 and 215 of the NPPF and the National Design Guide. The proposal would fail to preserve the historic special interest of the listed building and would therefore conflict against Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

It is considered that the overall size, scale and massing of the proposed two storey extension would be inappropriate within the context of the existing modest grade II listed building. The proposed alterations would also erode the existing historic fabric through the bricking up of the existing stores doorway.

Moreover, insufficient information has been provided demonstrating the level of historic interest to the first-floor rear elevation and the proposed roof repair works. As such, the proposed development would fail to have special regard towards the listed building and would result in less than substantial harm, towards the midpoint of the scale. The weighing exercise has concluded that limited weight can be attributed towards public benefits in this instance. The proposal would therefore fail to accord with the provisions of policies DP26 and DP34 of the District Plan, Policy BOLD1 of the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan, The Mid Sussex Design Guide, The National Design Guide and Paragraphs 135 and 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Decision: Refusal

Case Officer: Stefan Galyas