

Ref: HER-02131

Date: 24 April 2026

Charles Lewis
Crest Nicholson South,
500 Dashwood Lang Road,
Bourne Business Park,
Addlestone,
Surrey, KT15 2HJ

By email only

Dear Charles,

Built Heritage Assessment Addendum: Land at Scamps Hill, Lindfield

Introduction

This Built Heritage Assessment Addendum has been prepared by Tetra Tech Consulting Limited on behalf of Crest Nicholson South Limited regarding the proposed development of Land off Scamps Hill, Scaynes Hill Road, Lindfield, Mid Sussex, henceforth referred to as the 'Site'.

This Built Heritage Assessment Addendum accompanies a reserved matters application submitted to Mid-Sussex District Council ('the Council') for residential development with associated access and landscaping.

The relevant designated built heritage assets in this instance are:

- The Lindfield Conservation Area, located c.120m north-west of the Site;
- The Grade II Grayfriars (NHLE ref. 1025623), located c.25m southwest of the Site; and
- The Grade II Tythe Cottage (NHLE ref. 1180964), located c.105m south-east of the Site.

One non-designated built heritage asset is also relevant in this instance, comprising Walstead Grange, which lies 50m to the south-east of the Site.

The Site is subject to outline planning permission for up to 90 dwellings following the determination of an Appeal to the Planning Inspectorate ('PINS') (ref. APP/D3830/W/24/3350075). The Appeal was allowed by a PINS Inspector following the Council's non-determination of an outline planning application for residential development (ref. DM/24/0446). The approved description of development is as follows:

"The erection of up to 90 dwellings with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SuDS) and vehicular access point. All matters reserved except for means of access."

The Appeal decision identifies that less than substantial harm occurs, in the view of the Inspector, to the significance of two designated heritage assets, and that the significance of one non-designated heritage asset would also be adversely affected. The Inspector concluded however that the proposed development would *"not harm the character and appearance of the area"* and that *"the adverse impacts of the proposal would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits"* of the proposed development.

This Built Heritage Assessment Addendum considers if the historic built environment baseline of the Site has changed since the completion of a Built Heritage Statement (Pegasus Ltd, Feb. 2024) that was submitted with application ref. DM/24/0446. This Built Heritage Assessment Addendum further considers if any additional heritage assets may be relevant to the reserved matters application now submitted. This addendum then

considers if the built heritage impacts of the reserved matters application may differ from those impacts identified in the submitted Built Heritage Statement or Appeal decision.

The reserved matters proposed development is considered to result in a low level of less than substantial harm to the significance of one listed building, the Grade II Grayfriars. As a result of the provision of further details regarding the extent of open landscaped space within the Site and boundary treatments, the reserved matters proposals are not considered to affect the significance of any other relevant designated or non-designated built heritage asset.

In accordance with paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') any less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposed development.

Legislative, Policy and Guidance Context

No relevant legislative changes have occurred since the determination of the relevant outline planning application (ref. DM/24/0446) or Appeal (ref. APP/D3830/W/24/3350075).

In December 2024, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government issued a revised NPPF. Section 16 of the NPPF *Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment* was subject to minor revisions which do not materially alter the approach to the assessment of, or consideration of, built heritage impacts in a development context since the determination of the relevant outline planning application (ref. DM/24/0446) and Appeal (ref. APP/D3830/W/24/3350075).

The Mid-Sussex Local Plan was adopted in March 2018 and has not undergone any change since the determination of the relevant outline planning application (ref. DM/24/0446) and Appeal (ref. APP/D3830/W/24/3350075).

No notable change has occurred in respect of relevant guidance issued by Historic England, and the principal relevant published guidance in this instance remains *GPA3: The Setting of Heritage Assets* (Dec. 2017, Second Edition).

Proposed development:

The proposed development for the reserved matters application comprises the following description of development:

"A reserved matters application (access, appearance, layout, scale and landscaping) for 87 dwellings and associated infrastructure."

An extract from the submitted layout is included below.



Figure 1: Proposed Development Layout.

Previous Built Heritage Assessment Discussion

The relevant designated built heritage assets in this instance are:

- The Lindfield Conservation Area, located c.120m north-west of the Site;
- The Grade II Grayfriars (NHLE ref. 1025623), located c.25m southwest of the Site; and
- The Grade II Tythe Cottage (NHLE ref. 1180964), located c.105m south-east of the Site.

One non-designated built heritage asset is relevant in this instance, comprising Walstead Grange, which lies 50m to the south-east of the Site.

The potential impacts to the significance of all relevant built heritage assets occurs through the alteration of their settings.

GPA3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (Dec. 2017) specifies that 'setting' is neither a heritage asset, nor a designation. Paragraph 8 of that document also sets out that: "While setting can be mapped in the context of an individual application or proposal, it cannot be definitively and permanently described for all time as a spatially bounded area or as lying within a set distance of a heritage asset. This is because the surroundings of a heritage asset will change over time, and because new information on heritage assets may alter what might previously have been understood to comprise their setting and the values placed on that setting and therefore the significance of the heritage asset". Furthermore, the Steer Judgement ([2018] EWCA Civ 1697, July 2018) identifies that a decision maker must concentrate on the "surroundings in which [the heritage] asset is experienced", keeping in mind that those "surroundings" may change over time, and also that the way in which a heritage asset can be "experienced" is not limited only to the sense of sight. The "surroundings" of the heritage asset are its physical surroundings, and the relevant "experience", whatever it is, will be of the heritage asset itself in that physical place". The extent of an asset's setting should be understood as being limited to those spaces within which it is actually experienced in the present, rather than being expansively defined without sufficient regard to the extent of change that has occurred within its surrounds since its construction and operational use. It is the present, rather than past, setting of a heritage asset that is the baseline against which change occurring through development may be considered to have an effect on the asset's significance, whether that effect is beneficial or adverse.

Where harm to the significance of a heritage asset is incurred, the PPG (Paragraph: 018 Reference ID: 18a-018-20190723) specifies that *"within each category of harm (which category applies should be explicitly identified – substantial or less than substantial harm), the extent of the harm may vary and should be clearly articulated"*. In common practice, less than substantial harm, as distinct from substantial harm, is articulated using a spectrum (for example, 'at the lower end of the spectrum of less than substantial harm', or 'at the highest end of the spectrum of less than substantial harm'). The recent High Court decision ('Mead') iterated that the PPG and the NPPF are to be read and applied as a whole, being mindful that one may modify the other (Mead Realisations Ltd v Secretary of State for Housing Communities and Local Government and another [2025] EWCA Civ 32). Both documents are statements of national policy, issued by the Secretary of State, and there should be no legal distinction between them.

The submitted Built Heritage Statement (Pegasus Ltd, Feb. 2024) concludes that the development proposed under outline application ref.DM/24/0446 would cause a degree of harm at the lowest end of the spectrum of less than substantial harm to the significance of the Grade II Grayfriars (NHLE ref. 1025623), located c.25m southwest of the Site. This harm occurs as a result of the erosion of a remaining element of the building's historically rural-agricultural setting. The submitted Built Heritage Statement does not identify any harm to the significance of the Grade II Tythe Cottage or Lindfield Conservation Area as a result of intervening distance and or built development. The submitted built heritage statement identified a minor degree of harm to the significance of the Walstead Grange non-designated built heritage asset, which lies 50m to the south-east of the Site, occurring through the erosion of a rural-agricultural element of its setting.

In determining Appeal ref. APP/D3830/W/24/3350075, the Inspector identified a *"limited harm"* to the significance of the Grade II Grayfriars and Grade II Tythe Cottage. The Inspector identified a *"minor"* harm to the significance of the Walstead Grange non-designated built heritage asset. Regarding the Lindfield Conservation Area, the Inspector stated that the *"proposed planting would be beneficial to the character and appearance of the CA and the public access to the proposed open space would not be harmful"*. In reaching a conclusion on heritage impact, the Inspector considered that the proposed development would *"would cause 'less than substantial' harm to the heritage assets"*.

The conclusions of PINS and the submitted Built Heritage Statement are considered to be broadly comparable, with the differing positions in respect of the Grade II Tythe Cottage considered to represent a difference of professional opinion typical in the subjective nature of built heritage assessment. Notwithstanding the difference of position, the Inspector determined that the public benefits of the proposed development *"would be of sufficient weight to outweigh the harm identified to the significance and special interest of the designated heritage assets and non-designated heritage asset"*.

As a result of the unchanged legislative, national and local planning policy and guidance context, the conclusions of the submitted Built Heritage Statement (Pegasus Ltd, Feb. 2024) and PINS in determining Application ref. APP/D3830/W/24/3350075 are considered to remain valid.

Assessment of Impact: Reserved Matters Proposed Development

No additional built heritage assets to those considered in the submitted Built Heritage Statement and subsequent Appeal Decision have been identified as being relevant to the reserved matters proposed development.

The reserved matters proposed development represents a change of the overall character of the Site, from agricultural fields to modern built and landscaped space.

The proposed development will result in a change to the settings of the relevant designated and non-designated built heritage assets in which the positive contribution of the Site to the appreciation of their significance is lost or altered. The visual and character change effects of proposed development are, in some instances, mitigated by the retention of a substantial area of the eastern end of the Site, closest to the Grade II Tythe Cottage, as an open landscaped space. Other mitigation includes the retention and enhancement of planted boundaries along the southern boundary of the Site, opposite the Grade II Grayfriars.

In the context of the existing outline planning permission, the reserved matters proposed development is considered to represent a proportionate approach to the built delivery of the Site. The potential built heritage impacts of the reserved matters proposals are considered to be limited to a low level of less than substantial harm in respect of the Grade II Grayfriars only. This harm occurs through the simple proximity of new built

spaces to this listed building, which, while screened by enhanced planting, erode the remaining semi-rural or edge of settlement character of its setting. The degree of harm is not greater than low on the spectrum of less than substantial harm because the intrinsic architectural and historic interest of the building form which its significance is primarily derived will be unchanged. Nor will the ability to appreciate those interests be notably diminished by the increased presence of built form within its immediate-wider setting, of which the Site is a part.

As a result of the extent of retained landscaped space, and detailed planting provision, the proposed development is not considered to notably affect the significance of the Grade II Tythe Cottage or the non-designated Walstead Grange. The fundamental experience of these buildings, together with their intrinsic architectural and historic interest, will be unchanged.

No potential impacts are identified in respect of the Lindfield Conservation Area as a result of intervening modern development.

In accordance with paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') any less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposed development.

Conclusion

The Site is subject to outline planning permission for residential development following the determination of an Appeal to the Planning Inspectorate ('PINS') (ref. APP/D3830/W/24/3350075). The Appeal was allowed by a PINS Inspector following the Council's non-determination of an outline planning application for residential development (ref. DM/24/0446). The Appeal decision identifies that less than substantial harm occurs, in the view of the Inspector, to the significance of two designated heritage assets, and that the significance of one non-designated heritage asset would also be adversely affected. The Inspector concluded however that the proposed development would "*not harm the character and appearance of the area*" and that "*the adverse impacts of the proposal would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits*" of the proposed development.

The reserved matters proposed development represents a change of the overall character of the Site, from agricultural fields to modern built and landscaped space. In the context of the existing outline planning permission, the reserved matters proposed development is considered to represent a proportionate approach to the built delivery of the Site. The potential built heritage impacts of the reserved matters proposals are considered to be limited to a low level of less than substantial harm in respect of the Grade II Grayfriars only.

No other built heritage impacts are identified as a result of the provision of detailed landscaping measures as part of the reserved matters application.

In accordance with paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') any less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposed development.

Yours sincerely,



Anthony Brown

Heritage Consultant

D 07701 277 424

E Anthony.Brown1@tetrattech.com