

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/0610	Case Officer:	Emily Wade
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent		
Proposal:	Retrospective Listed Building Consent relating to the replacement of two ground floor windows and the regularisation of three additional windows installed prior to the current owner's occupation.		
Site:	Grove Cottage, 122 College Lane, Hurstpierpoint, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9AJ, ,		
Validation Date	9 Jun 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	10 Jul 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	3 Aug 2026
Target Date:	4 Aug 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Emily Wade</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	4 Aug 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/0610

Grove Cottage, 122 College Lane, Hurstpierpoint, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9AJ, Retrospective Listed Building Consent relating to the replacement of two ground floor windows and the regularisation of three additional windows installed prior to the current owner's occupation.

Mrs Elizabeth Bee

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

N/A.

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Recommend that planning permission is granted.

INTRODUCTION

Grove Cottage is a Grade II listed early 19th century building located in a semi-rural position to the northern edge of Hurst Wickham. The current retrospective application is for the retention of several double glazed replacement windows which have been installed by the current and previous owners without consent.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

10/03476/FUL and 10/02789/LBC Planning permission and listed building consent granted for reconstruction of the kitchen with a breakfast room extension. This permission included the use of double-glazed windows.

DM/22/3330 Listed building consent refused for replacement of all softwood single glazed sash windows to hardwood slimline double glazed units and a change of style to two windows at the front and back of the property

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Grove Cottage is a Grade II listed early 19th century house located in a semi-rural position to the northern edge of Hurst Wickham. The cottage has painted brick elevations under a hipped slate roof, with a single storey addition to the northern side. Originally the house had timber sash windows, several of which have been replaced, including by those which are the subject of this application.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The current proposal is for the retention of a number of replacement double glazed windows which have been installed by the current and previous owners without consent. These include two double glazed sash windows to the ground floor front elevation, a further double glazed sash window at first floor to the front elevation, and two windows to the bathroom to the northern side elevation.

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 Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common 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

No relevant policies.

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 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:

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...
- Traditional building materials and construction techniques are normally used.'

The current proposal is for retention of a number of timber-double glazed windows which have been installed as replacements to the front and side elevations of Grove Cottage, a Grade II listed early 19th century building. These windows apparently replaced previously existing windows which were in a poor state of repair.

A previous application for the retention of these windows alongside the further replacement of the remaining windows to the house with double glazed units was refused in 2022 on grounds that the glazing bar design and the inclusion of double glazing would be harmful to the appearance and hence the special interest of the listed building.

The current proposal relates to windows apparently designed to match the appearance of the windows that were replaced, with slimline double-glazed units and functional glazing bars. The windows replaced appear to have been relatively modern and/or in a poor state of repair.

Since 2022 the relevant policy context has evolved, with the adoption of updated guidance by Historic England (HEAN 18, Adapting Historic Buildings for Energy and Carbon Efficiency), which is generally supportive of the use of slimline double-glazed units on listed buildings, where this can be incorporated without loss of historic glazing or damage to historic window frames. In this instance, although the windows have been replaced in their entirety, on balance on the basis of the evidence available it would appear that the windows were not of any great age or interest, or were in poor condition.

Furthermore, the recently revised NPPF includes at paragraph 167 the requirement that 'Local planning authorities should... give significant weight to the need to support energy efficiency and low carbon heating improvements to existing buildings, both domestic and non-domestic.' This stands to be balanced against the great weight that must be given to the conservation of heritage assets under the requirements of paragraph 212.

On balance, in light of this updated planning policy and guidance, and in the context of the available evidence relating to the windows which have been removed, it is not considered that an objection to the proposed retention of the replacement windows could be sustained.

The proposal is therefore considered to meet 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