

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/2588	Case Officer:	Andrew Horrell
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent		
Proposal:	Erection of oak framed side and rear extensions		
Site:	Chatesgrove, Cross Colwood Lane, Bolney, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5RY, ,		
Validation Date	16 Oct 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	21 Nov 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Refusal	Recommendation Date:	23 Dec 2025
Target Date:	11 Dec 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	Andrew Horrell

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	23 Dec 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/2588

**Chatesgrove, Cross Colwood Lane, Bolney, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5RY,
Erection of oak framed side and rear extensions
Mr Jack Nethercott**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

MSDC Conservation Officer:

Although the extensions are single storey, they are over a significantly enlarged footprint in comparison with the previous approval and are considerably greater in overall bulk. In my opinion, this results in an unacceptable relationship of scale between the historic core of the building and the additions to it, particularly bearing in mind the cumulative impact of these extensions with the existing very substantial early 20th century wing.

This adverse impact is exacerbated by the depth of the projection of the additions to the rear (west) side of the building, in that they project beyond the historic rear building line of the house. This increases the undue visual prominence of the extensions in relation to the 17th century house.

Furthermore, the current proposal in the manner in which the orangery extension abuts and extends beyond the north elevation of the historic core, and wraps around to attach to its western elevation, blurs the differentiation between the 17th century house and the 20th century extension, and has an adverse impact on the manner in which the surviving historic fabric of the elevations concerned can be seen and appreciated. A potential for damage to the fabric from the attachment of the extension would also be present.

The roof forms of both elements are not sympathetic to the context. The gables to the northern elevation, although intended to mimic the existing gables to the house, are greater in scale and therefore exacerbate the undue visual prominence of this elevation. The long, gabled roof form also appears awkward juxtaposed with the hipped roof of the existing house. It should be noted that this existing roof is 20th century, not 17th century in date (as suggested in the submitted heritage statement) and thus the existing permission did not result in any direct impact on the more historic fabric of the house. The extensive flat roof proposed to the rear is also not a sympathetic response to the existing roof forms of the house.

Aspects of the detailing, including the fenestration, to both elements are also considered unsympathetic to the context.

For these reasons, I consider that the proposal detracts from the special interest of the listed building, contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34. In terms of the NPPF, I would place the harm as less than substantial, at the mid-high range of that scale, such that the balancing exercise set out in paragraph 215 will apply. I would also consider the proposal contrary to the requirements of the Council's adopted Design Guide, specifically Design Principles DG49, DG50 and DG51.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No objection subject to the support of the Conservation Officer.

INTRODUCTION

Listed building consent is sought for the erection of oak framed side and rear extensions.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/18/3238 - Proposed part one storey and part two storey extension to existing house including internal and external alterations. New cellar below proposed extension to north. New dormer window to east elevation. Demolition of existing garden store and replacement with a single storey guest lodge (ancillary accommodation to main dwelling). Works to landscape and driveway, including replacement gates and re-configured entrance. (approved)

DM/20/3145 - Internal alterations to existing house including to fenestration. Demolition of existing garden store and replacement single storey guest lodge (ancillary accommodation to main dwelling). Erection of poolhouse. Works to landscape and driveway, including replacement gates and re-configured entrance. (approved)

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Chatesgrove is a Grade II listed building dating originally from the early 17th century, with later alterations. It is situated in substantial grounds in rural position outside the village of Bolney.

It is a two storey detached hipped roofed dwelling with pitched gables to front and rear. The walls are a mix of timber and Horsham stone, timber doors and windows. It is characterised by an existing side porch and rear porch.

To the north-east of the site is outbuildings with pool and woodland beyond, to the south-east of the site is the sloped driveway to a parking area and equestrian facilities beyond, to the south-west of the site is hedging and woodland to highway beyond and to the north-west is the rear garden with woodland to The Yards beyond.

The site is situated within the countryside and the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (HWAONB) as defined in the District and Neighbourhood Plans.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The existing side utility lean-to is to be removed which measures approximately 2.75m in depth, 2m in width with a height to eaves of 2.25m and an overall height of 3.2m.

The proposed side/rear side extension approximately measures 13.36m in maximum depth, 15.51m in maximum width. The pitched roofed side kitchen/dining room has an approximate height to eaves of 2.35m and an overall height of 5.65m. The flat roofed lounge/garden room has a flat roofed height of 2.773m with the roof lantern adding approximately 0.7m in height.

Internal works include the dining room changed to a snug, the kitchen changed to a utility room with a door to the opened-up entrance hall/boot room to replace the existing hall and breakfast room.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND LIST OF POLICIES

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:

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.

Relevant policies.

None relevant.

Neighbourhood Plan

The Bolney Neighbourhood Plan was 'made' in September 2016. It forms part of the development plan with full weight.

Relevant policy:

BOLD1 Design of New Development and Conservation

Other Legislation

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Other Material Considerations

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.

Mid Sussex District Plan 2021-2039 Submission 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 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

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024)

Paragraphs 210, 212-215 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.

Considering potential impacts

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:

- 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'.

The proposed single storey extensions are a significant enlargement in footprint and bulk from the previous approvals at the property. It is considered that the proposal would create an unacceptable relationship of scale between the historic core of the building and the additions to it, particularly bearing in mind the cumulative impact of these proposed extensions with the existing very substantial early 20th century wing. The current proposal in the manner in which the orangery extension abuts and extends beyond the north elevation of the historic core, and wraps around to attach to its western elevation, blurs the differentiation between the 17th century house and the 20th century extension

Therefore, the proposal is seen to detract from the special interest of the listed building, contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34. In terms of the NPPF, the conservation officer places the harm as less than substantial, at the mid-high range of that scale, such that the balancing exercise set out in paragraph 215 will apply.

In terms of the NPPF the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the heritage assets, as set out in paragraph 215, and is weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The proposal relates to the enlargement of the existing residential property, and no specific public benefit for the proposal has been put forward. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not result in a public benefit (of a private domestic extension) that would outweigh this harm.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

The special interest of the listed building would be detracted by the design, form and scale of the proposed extension and would cause less than substantial harm to the special interest of the building. It is therefore considered that the proposal would be contrary to policy DP34 of the District Plan, the requirements of the NPPF and the Listed Building and Conservation Area (LBCA) Act 1990.

It is recommended that listed building consent is refused.

Decision: Refusal

Case Officer: Andrew Horrell