

Delegated Decision
Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/0422	Case Officer:	Anna Tidey
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent		
Proposal:	Proposed alterations to approved plans relating to Listed Building Consent DM/21/0568.		
Site:	Bowling Alley Cottage, The Green, Horsted Keynes, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 7AP, ,		
Validation Date	17 Feb 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	7 May 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	2 Jul 2025
Target Date:	14 Apr 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	Anna Tidey

Date Legal Agreement Completed: (if applicable)		No of Representations:	1
---	--	------------------------	---

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	2 Jul 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/0422

**Bowling Alley Cottage, The Green, Horsted Keynes, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 7AP,
Proposed alterations to approved plans relating to Listed Building Consent DM/21/0568.
Mr Matthew Ollier**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

One representation received, which objects to the application, on the following grounds:

- The current c1950's extension to the Grade II Listed Building is not sympathetic to Bowling Alley Cottage. This attractive historic property sits in a Conservation area and in close proximity to other Listed Buildings.
- The LPA should have regard to DP34 and DP35 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF. This includes minimising the height and mass of the link extension and ensuring that materials used are sympathetic to those used on the Cottage.
- The Planning Authority should seek to achieve a less dominating link extension building and a more sympathetic treatment for the doors/windows . The proposed aluminium framed treatment jars with the Cottage and is inappropriate.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Conservation Officer: These applications are for alterations to an approved scheme of alteration and extension to the property, which is a Grade II listed C17th building located within the Horsted Keynes Conservation Area. The historic cottage has substantial extensions to the rear, comprising a c. mid 20th century outbuilding which was later joined to the house by a link extension, and then further extended by an infill kitchen addition between the two, leaving a small courtyard between the kitchen and house which is bounded by the link to one side and a historic external WC and boundary wall to the other.

Planning permission and listed building consent were granted in 2021 for the enlargement of the kitchen extension and partial replacement and enlargement of the existing link extension, internal renovations to the annexe building and a new dormer window, and internal alterations to the historic core of the existing cottage. These permissions have been partly implemented and are considered to be extant.

The currently proposed amendments to the approved scheme are as follows:

- Alterations to the form and footprint of the rebuilt link extension, to remove an approved projection to the southern side, with changes to the elevational treatment to introduce more solid wall over the approved glazing;
- Amendments to the construction of the external wall to the kitchen extension, facing onto the courtyard, from a glazed screen to a solid masonry construction;
- Changes to the approved layout of the annexe;
- Alteration to the southern elevation of the annexe to replace French windows to a large aluminium framed window; and
- Amendments to the approved internal layout of the Cottage.

To consider these proposals in turn:

- The proposed changes to the form and footprint of the link extension remove the approved projection into the garden to the south of the house, so that the building line will be similar to the existing. This is not considered contentious in principle, however the height of the replacement link has increased so that it now sits above rather than below the eaves of the annexe building and rises higher up the catslide roof to the rear of the original building. This is not considered acceptable due to the adverse

impact on the subservience of the link to the cottage and annexe, as well as the fabric of the catslide, and should be reconsidered. Furthermore proposed changes to the elevation to introduce more solidity will add to the apparent bulk of the link as well as reducing the extent to which it allows a visual separation between the house and the bulk of the annexe. The use of aluminium framed windows in place of timber framed also does not relate well to the context. I would also suggest that this should be reconsidered.

- For similar reasons to those given above the proposed amendments to the external wall of the kitchen extension are in my opinion contentious. One of the reasons why this extension was considered acceptable in the context of the existing additions to the building was the lightweight and transparent treatment of this elevation, which reduced the apparent bulk of the addition and mitigated the manner in which it imposes on the existing courtyard space. I would therefore recommend that this aspect of the proposal is also reconsidered.
- The changes to the internal layout of the annexe are not considered contentious.
- The proposed amendment to the southern elevation of the annexe to introduce a large aluminium framed window detracts from the appearance of the building. Although the annexe is relatively modern and is not of a particularly sympathetic design, the form and proportions and the framing material of the proposed window do not relate well to the existing building or the context, and would further detract from the appearance of the annexe and the contribution it makes to the setting of the cottage. Although I would not object to the French windows approved being replaced with a window, the scale, design, glazing pattern and framing material require reconsideration.
- The proposed amendments to the internal works to the main house comprise alterations to the floor plan in the area of the proposed shower room and laundry. These amendments would have no greater impact on the historic fabric or room plan than the approved scheme, and in would fact retain more of the existing layout. This aspect of the proposal is not considered contentious.

Although not consistently shown (in that they do not appear on the elevations), on of the proposed plans shows solar PV panels to the roof of the link extension and kitchen. This appears a fairly extensive installation which has the potential to be quite visually intrusive. We would require more information in order to be able to comment fully, including a more detailed layout to show the number and position of the panels, elevations and sections to show the panels in context, and further details such as a manufacturer's spec. to show the appearance, height and dimensions of the panels themselves.

In summary, although aspects of the proposal are not considered contentious in principle, several elements require reconsideration and/or further information.

As it stands the proposal would be considered detrimental to the special interest of the listed building and to the contribution which it makes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This would fail to meet the requirements of District Plan Policies DP34 and DP35. In terms of the NPPF, the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to each asset- it is not possible to be more exact without a better understanding of the solar PV installation which may (or may not) contribute to this harm.

Further comments: The height of the bulk of the link remains as submitted, so that this aspect of the concerns has not been addressed, although the section attaching directly to the house has been lowered, so that the impact on the historic fabric of the catslide appears to now be as previously approved. Although the elevational treatment has been amended due to the inclusion of a lower, lead clad section adjacent to the house, the issue with relative solidity of the extension remains as previously raised. The proposed aluminium windows are also retained as part of the scheme. These issues therefore remain contentious.

The courtyard facing elevations have also been amended but although the amount of glazing has been increased, the proposal still does not have the lightweight quality of the approved scheme, and the aluminium windows are retained. This aspect of the proposal also therefore remains contentious.

The proposed window has been omitted in favour of French windows similar in design to the approval, which addresses this aspect of the previous comments. However, the French windows continue to be shown with aluminium frames, which remains contentious.

Further comments: The plans have been further revised to increase the amount of glazing to the elevations of the replacement link extension. In my opinion, on balance and given the nature of the existing link, this aspect of the proposal is now acceptable. I do however remain concerned about aspects of the proposed materials, specifically the window/door frames which are now shown as a mix of aluminium and composite. If aluminium was previously approved, as the applicant suggested during our recent meeting, then it would not be reasonable to object to this, but composite will not normally be favourably viewed in the context of a listed building. Hopefully this aspect can however be dealt with by condition, provided that the applicant is aware that we will not accept composite.

Subject to the above, the proposal is now considered to meet the requirements of District Plan Policies DP34 and DP35, and of the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

I suggest the following conditions:

- Details of roofing and facing materials
- Detailed drawings, at an appropriate large scale, including sections and annotated to show materials and finishes, of the following;
 - typical examples of new windows and doors (including internal doors to the main house)
 - typical eaves detail to the link extension
- New rainwater goods and any other new external pipework to be of painted metal
- Detailed hard and soft landscaping scheme, or details of the material(s) to extended terrace and steps, as considered appropriate

Replacement rooflight to the rear roof slope of the main house to be a flush fitting, metal framed, conservation style rooflight.

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Horsted Keynes Parish Council: No comments received.

INTRODUCTION

This application seeks Listed Building Consent for amendment to the plans approved under Listed Building Consent DM/21/0568. There is a corresponding application to vary Condition 2 of DM/21/0566 for planning permission to allow for changes to the approved plans, reported separately for Approval under Planning application DM/25/0272.

Works have commenced on part of the approved work. This application relates to the link extension between the Listed Building at Bowling Alley Cottage and the outbuilding sited to the rear.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/25/0272. Proposed Variation of condition 2 relating to planning application DM/21/0566 to allow for alterations to approved plans. Yet to be determined.

DM/21/0568. Listed Building Consent: Enlargement of kitchen and partial replacement and enlargement of the existing link extensions. Internal renovations to annex including new dormer window. Internal alterations to existing cottage. Approved May 2021.

DM/21/0566. Enlargement of kitchen and partial replacement and enlargement of the existing link extensions. Internal renovations to annex including new dormer window. Internal alterations to existing cottage. Approved May 2021.

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

Bowling Alley Cottage is a detached Grade II Listed building, located off The Green in Horsted Keynes..

The property is located in the Conservation Area within the Built up Area boundary of Horsted Keynes.

APPLICATION DETAILS

Listed Building Consent was granted under DM/21/0568 for internal and external works to enlarge the main dwelling and linked annex building at Bowling Alley Cottage. The works have been commenced to add a new set of French doors and a dormer window in the annexe building. The approved works to the adjoining link section have not commenced. This application seeks Listed Building Consent to amend the design of that element.

The application has been accompanied by a detailed Design and Access and Heritage Statement. The application has also been supported by a detailed Summary of modifications Statement, which includes a detailed explanation for the proposed changes, including a justification for raising the roof height on the addition, with structural and thermal reasons explained, details of the interface treatment for the abutment of the extension with the catslide roof form on the cottage, comments regarding the degree of glazing in the link addition, mass modelling, window and door finish details and details regarding the French doors (to be retained) and the solar panels (to be removed from the scheme).

These documents are available to view on the planning file.

Amended plans have been submitted for the link addition as the application has progressed to address design concerns raised by the Conservation Officer. The changes to the scheme include the removal of a 3.4m wide by 4.25m deep timber framed central roof lantern and a wood burning stove flue in the link addition, the introduction instead of a pair of 2.4m wide by 1.1m wide roof lights, the addition of more glazing in the side elevations of the link addition, the introduction of a stepped link section into the catslide roof to align with the roof height of the former approved scheme and the removal of solar panels from the proposal.

In addition amended plans for the second floor of the cottage have been submitted and clarification sought from the applicant to confirm that no changes are proposed on this level of the property.

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 and the Horsted Keynes Neighbourhood Plan and the Site Allocations DPD.

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.

The following policies are considered relevant when considering this application:

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.

Other Material Considerations

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 the 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:

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.

Horsted Keynes Neighbourhood Plan - made May 2023

Policy HK6 Conserving Local Heritage

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024)

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

ASSESSMENT

The only issue to consider in this instance is the impact on the listed building.

As such the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is relevant to the consideration of the application. S. 66 states:

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.'

District Plan Policy DP34 is relevant in the determination of this application. It states:

'Listed Buildings

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 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 207-210 of the NPPF state:

'207. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.

208. Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.

209. Where there is evidence of deliberate neglect of, or damage to, a heritage asset, the deteriorated state of the heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision.

210. 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.'

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.

Also relevant is Neighbourhood Plan Policy HK6, which states:

'Development proposals should preserve or enhance the special character and setting of the Horsted Keynes and Birch Grove Conservation Areas, and preserve or enhance the special architectural or historic interest of listed buildings and their settings, and will be assessed against policies DP 34 and DP35 of the Mid Sussex District Plan.

All planning applications which affect a heritage asset or its setting, should be accompanied by a Heritage Statement, which demonstrates a clear understanding of the heritage significance of the assets affected and which then informs the development of sensitive proposals which meet the statutory requirements for their preservation and enhancement. In particular, development proposals should have regard to the following special features of the two conservation areas:

Horsted Keynes

o the spacious character of The Green, the attractive groupings of buildings around The Green and the sense of enclosure created by both buildings and landscaping

o the variety of age and style of buildings, several of which are listed buildings

o the use of traditional and natural building materials

o the extensive views of the countryside from within the Conservation Area, especially around St Giles Church and the views of the church from within the village
o the hedgerows, trees and banked verges, including those in Church Lane, Bonfire Lane and Wyatts Lane Birch Grove
o the small triangular green, around which the majority of the buildings are clustered, away from the highway;
o the absence of through traffic resulting in a peaceful and attractive environment.

Development proposals should demonstrate that they have taken into account the potential impact on above and below ground archaeological deposits and to avoid or minimise impacts to sites that may be identified as previously unidentified heritage assets.

Potential impacts should be identified in a supporting Heritage Statement as part of any planning application and any harm or loss of significance will require robust justification in terms of the delivery of public benefits that could not otherwise be provided.'

Bowling Alley Cottage is Grade II Listed. It is located in a group of Listed properties located off The Green in the centre of the village.

Detailed comments have been provided by the Conservation Officer on the proposed works during the course of determining the application. The comments are reported above and her views are accepted.

With the agreed recommended planning conditions it is considered that the proposal will preserve the special interest of the listed building. The proposal will meet the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34, Neighbourhood Plan Policy HK6 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the amended proposal is considered to be appropriate in terms of design and appearance and would not negatively impact on the character and appearance of the Listed dwelling or its setting. The proposal would accord with Policy DP34 of the District Plan, Policy HK6 of the Horsted Keynes Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Detailed planning conditions will control the detail of the proposed works.

Consequently it is recommended that Listed Building Consent is granted.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Anna Tidey