

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/1490	Case Officer:	Hamish Evans
Application Type:	Full Application		
Proposal:	Installation of an electric charging point.		
Site:	17 The Old Convent, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 3RS, , , ,		
Validation Date	23 Jun 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	25 Jul 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	13 Aug 2025
Target Date:	18 Aug 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	Hamish Evans

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	13 Aug 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/1490

**17 The Old Convent, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 3RS, , ,
Installation of an electric charging point.
Dr Julie Anne Goode**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

No third-party letters of representation have been received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

MSDC Conservation Officer

Low level of less than substantial harm identified.

Historic England

No comment.

TOWN COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

East Grinstead Town Council

No comment.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks planning permission for the installation of an electric charging point at 17 The Old Convent East Grinstead RH19 3RS.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/25/1491. Installation of an electric charging point. Pending consideration.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site is located within the East Grinstead built up area boundary and consist of a flat within a Grade I listed building, 1-31 The Old Convent Moat Road East Grinstead. The existing building is a significant former convent which was converted to residential flats in the 1980's. It is characterised by light stone blockwork walls, brown clay roof tiles, timber door frames and Crittall window frames. The entrance to 17 The Old Convent is within the northwest facing elevation of the existing building and there are several off-street parking space to the northwest of the entrance. Residential properties are located to the north, east and south of the site and private road is located to the west. The site is also surrounded by a significant woodland.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The application seeks planning permission for the installation of an electric charging point at 17 The Old Convent East Grinstead RH19 3RS.

The proposed works consist of the drilling of a 0.25mm hole in the existing external wall, the installation of a power cable fixed to the external wall and the installation of a power outlet box to the external wall.

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 East Grinstead 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

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.

East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan

The East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan was adopted November 2016.

Relevant policies:

EG3 - Promoting Good Design

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.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024)

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

ASSESSMENT

Character, Design and Impact on Heritage Assets

The LPA is under a duty by virtue of s.66 of the Listed Building and Conservation Area (LBCA) Act 1990 (Decision on application): to 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.

Recent case law has stated that 'As the Court of Appeal has made absolutely clear in its recent decision in Barnwell, the duties in sections 66 and 72 of the Listed Buildings Act do not allow a local planning authority to treat the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings and the character and appearance of conservation areas as mere material considerations to which it can simply attach such weight as it sees fit. If there was any doubt about this before the decision in Barnwell it has now been firmly dispelled. When an authority finds that a proposed development would harm the setting of a listed building or the character or appearance of a conservation area, it must give that harm considerable importance and weight.'

The Courts further stated on this point 'This does not mean that an authority's assessment of likely harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area is other than a matter for its own planning judgment. It does not mean that the weight the authority should give to harm which it considers would be limited or less than substantial must be the same as the weight it might give to harm which would be substantial. But it is to recognize, as the Court of Appeal emphasized in Barnwell, that a finding of harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area gives rise to a strong presumption against planning permission being granted. The presumption is a statutory one. It is not irrebuttable. It can be outweighed by material considerations powerful enough to do so. But an authority can only properly strike the balance between harm to a heritage asset on the one hand and planning benefits on the other if it is conscious of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation and if it demonstrably applies that presumption to the proposal it is considering.'

Policy DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states:

'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.*

Other Heritage Assets

Development that retains buildings which are not listed but are of architectural or historic merit, or which make a significant and positive contribution to the street scene will be permitted in preference to their demolition and redevelopment.

The Council will seek to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the character and quality of life of the District. Significance can be defined as the special interest of a heritage asset, which may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic.

Proposals affecting such heritage assets will be considered in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and current Government guidance.'

The application building The Convent is a grade I listed building.

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.'

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex 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:

- is of high quality design and layout and includes appropriate landscaping and greenspace;*
- 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;*
- creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape;*
- protects open spaces, trees and gardens that contribute to the character of the area;*
- protects valued townscapes and the separate identity and character of towns and villages;*

- *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 (see Policy DP27);*
- *creates a pedestrian-friendly layout that is safe, well connected, legible and accessible;*
- *incorporates well integrated parking that does not dominate the street environment, particularly where high density housing is proposed;*
- *positively addresses sustainability considerations in the layout and the building design;*
- *take the opportunity to encourage community interaction by creating layouts with a strong neighbourhood focus/centre; larger (300+ unit) schemes will also normally be expected to incorporate a mixed use element;*
- *optimises the potential of the site to accommodate development.'*

A similar ethos is contained within the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD and within policy EG3 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

The proposed works are modest in their nature and due to their location and the existing planting surrounding the site there would be limited views of the proposed works from the public realm. The existing planting is well established and there is no reason to believe that it would be removed in the future.

The Council's Conservation Officer has commented on the application and has stated that the proposal would result in low level of less than substantial harm to the listed building. They placed the level of harm caused at the lowest end of the less than substantial scale.

Whilst these comments are noted the proposed works are modest in their nature and due to their position there would be limited views of them from public or private views. There is also existing cabling visible on the external walls of the building. Taking into account the above whilst the Council's Conservation Officers comments are noted, the proposal is not considered to result in harm to the existing listed building and the proposal would preserve the special interest of the listed building. Therefore the proposal complies with policies DP26 and DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.

Neighbouring Amenities

Policy DP26 in part seeks to ensure that development:

'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 (see Policy DP29);'

A similar ethos is contained within the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.

A similar ethos is also found within Policies EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan. Although Policy EG3 states that proposals should "not harm" adjoining neighbours amenity whereas policy DP26 of the MSDP states that development should 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. There is therefore some conflict between the District Plan and Neighbourhood Plan in this respect. Under section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 if a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan, the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approved or published. As such, policy DP26 of the MSDP is considered to take precedence and therefore the test in this instance is whether the development causes significant harm to neighbouring amenities as outlined above.

Due to the location and nature of the proposal it is considered to not cause significant harm to the amenities of nearby residents including taking account of the impact on overlooking and loss of privacy, reduction in sunlight and daylight and a loss of outlook. The proposal is therefore, considered to comply with the above-mentioned part of policy DP26 and the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.

Biodiversity Net Gain

Biodiversity net gain is required under a statutory framework introduced by Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Under the statutory framework for biodiversity net gain this application comprises of development below the de-minimis threshold meaning that this development is exempt from providing biodiversity net gain.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the proposal is considered to preserve the special interest of the listed building and it would not cause significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers. The application is also exempt from the requirement to provide biodiversity net gain. Therefore, the proposal complies with policies DP26 and DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policy EG3 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan, the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD, the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and with the relevant provisions of the NPPF.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Hamish Evans