

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/26/0506	Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent		
Proposal:	Replacement of existing modern steel windows with slimline heritage double glazing to windows GF01, GF02, GF07, GF08, GF09, FF01, FF02, FF03, FF04, FF09 as labelled on proposed plans, together with the replacement of the existing rooflight in the downstairs bathroom with a new conservation roof light.		
Site:	Whitehouse Farm Cottage, Staplefield Lane, Staplefield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 6AU, ,		
Validation Date	26 Feb 2026	Overall Expiry Date:	3 Apr 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	16 Apr 2026
Target Date:	23 Apr 2026	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:	16 Apr 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/26/0506

Whitehouse Farm Cottage, Staplefield Lane, Staplefield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 6AU,

Replacement of existing modern steel windows with slimline heritage double glazing to windows GF01, GF02, GF07, GF08, GF09, FF01, FF02, FF03, FF04, FF09 as labelled on proposed plans, together with the replacement of the existing roolight in the downstairs bathroom with a new conservation roof light.

Mr Julian Date

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

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

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Conservation Officer: *'The principle of the replacement of the existing modern steel windows with timber framed casements is not considered contentious in the context of the existing approvals. The proposed inclusion of slim-line double glazed units may have some adverse impact on the traditional appearance of the windows, in particular in terms of the reflectivity of the glazing. I would however place any harm arising from this at the lower end of the less than substantial scale- in the context of the NPPF paragraph 215, this harm would stand to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In making this judgement the Council must also be aware of the great weight that must be given to the conservation of heritage assets under paragraph 213 of the NPPF, and the significant weight that must be given to the need to support energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings under paragraph 167.'*

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Parish Council: No comment received.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks listed building consent for the replacement of the existing steel windows to the ground and first floor with timber framed windows incorporating slim-line double glazing. The proposal would also replace an existing rooflight with a conservation style rooflight.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/25/0795 - Internal and External Alterations Including Replacement of Windows and Widened Parking Area. Permission 30.06.2025.

DM/25/0796 - Internal and external alterations including replacement of windows and widened parking area. Permission 27.06.2025.

DM/26/0505 - Replacement of existing modern steel windows with slimline heritage double glazing to windows GF01, GF02, GF07, GF08, GF09, FF01, FF02, FF03, FF04, FF09 as labelled on proposed plans, together with the replacement of the existing roolight in the downstairs bathroom with a new conservation roof light. Pending consideration.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application relates to Whitehouse Farm Cottage, a grade II listed building set to the eastern side of the highway. The cottage appears to have been constructed during the 18th century as a single dwelling

but later subdivided into separate dwellings. There are two ranges to the property, including a front brick-built range with a tiled roof and a rear stone ashlar range. The existing property is listed under the following description:

'C 18. Two storeys. Three windows. Red brick and grey headers. Horsham slab roof. Casement windows.'

The site is not set within any designated settlement boundary and there are other grade II listed buildings nearby such as Whitehouse Cottage to the northeast which formed a loose grouping with the application site and Whitehouse Farm to the south. The site is also set within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposed development would replace the existing steel windows at ground and first floor level at the cottage with new timber framed windows which would feature slim line double glazing.

The existing rooflight on the roof of the single storey side (south-east) elevation lean to element would be replaced with a conservation style rooflight.

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 Ansty and Staplefield 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

DP39: Sustainable Design and Construction

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

Ansty, Staplefield and Brook Street Neighbourhood Plan 2015-2031 (Made February 2017)

Relevant Policies:

None relevant.

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:

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, 167, 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 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 architectural value, historic value and group 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:

'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'

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.

It is considered that the existing building subject to the application is positioned within a rural setting with sporadically placed dwellings positioned along Staplefield Lane. The application site is set slightly back from the highway edge by both a private driveway and pedestrian stepped access. The dwelling is considered to be afforded modest yet verdant grounds to both the front and rear.

A new conservation style rooflight would also replace the existing rooflight to the existing single storey lean to element on the side (south-eastern) elevation. It was commented by the Conservation Officer that this element is not considered to be contentious in terms of its impact on the heritage asset.

The proposed development would replace a number of windows at both ground and firsts floor level with new timber slim-line double glazed units. It was noted in response to the proposal from the Council's Conservation Officer that there may be some adverse impact on the traditional appearance of the windows due to the reflectivity of the new glazing. Accordingly, it was considered that the level of harm caused would be placed at the lower end of the less than substantial scale. The Case Officer agrees with the Conservation Officer comments as outlined above.

Where the harm would be less than substantial, in terms of the NPPF, the criteria set out in paragraph 215 of that document would apply. This states that *'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.'* This is the balancing exercise that must be undertaken by the decision maker, ensuring that considerable importance and weight is given to the less than substantial harm to the heritage asset that has been identified.

It is recognised that the Local Planning authority is required to give significant weight towards the need to support energy efficiency and low carbon heating improvements to existing domestic buildings as outlined in paragraph 167 of the NPPF. Furthermore, DP39 of the District Plan supports the use of measures to minimise energy use through design.

As outlined within the submitted Heritage and Design and Access Statement, the proposals rationale is to improve energy efficiency. In turn, this would reduce heat loss and lower operational carbon emissions. Within the climate emergency, this benefit is considered to attribute limited weight given the small domestic scale of the scheme. However, when coupled with the significant weight required by paragraph 167 of the NPPF towards supporting energy efficiency, these reasons are considered to cumulatively outweigh the low end of less than substantial harm towards the heritage asset.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to comply with the provisions of Policy DP26 of the District Plan and the statutory duties as set out within the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

Although the proposal would inflict some less than substantial harm towards the listed building, this is considered to be set to the lower end of the scale. This should be weighed against the significant weight attributed to the use of renewable energy sources from paragraph 167 of the NPPF and further compliance with DP39 of the District Plan. As a result, it is considered that the proposal would comply with the development plan when read as a whole.

To summarise, it is considered that the proposals will have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area and neighbouring amenities. As such, the application complies with Policies DP26 and DP39 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, the Ansty and Staplefield 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