

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/0131	Case Officer:	Katherine Williams
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent		
Proposal:	Replacement of front door.		
Site:	The Old Bakery, 65 And 65A High Street, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2HN, ,		
Validation Date	13 Jan 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	14 Feb 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Refusal	Recommendation Date:	10 Mar 2025
Target Date:	10 Mar 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	Katherine Williams

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Steven King	Date:	10 Mar 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/0131

**The Old Bakery, 65 And 65A High Street, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2HN,
Replacement of front door.**

Mr Stephen Yeomans

LETTERS OF REPRESENTATION

None received

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

MSDC Conservation Officer - no objection

Historic England - No comments to make, defer to LPA Conservation Officer

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to this application

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks listed building consent for the replacement of the front door.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

05/01392/LBC - Provide new porch to rear elevation and replace existing dormer window with hipped and tiled roof. Refused

05/02641/LBC - Replacement of 4 No. (rear) defective windows. Refused

07/00175/LBC - Provide new porch to rear elevation, replace existing dormer window with hipped and tiled roof, and replacement windows. Granted

DM/23/2298 - Change of use from Class E to residential dwelling Class C3 to form part of the existing residential property. Proposed and retrospective internal and external alterations including rear gates. Granted

DM/23/2304 - Change of use from Class E to residential dwelling Class C3 to form part of the existing residential property. Proposed and retrospective internal and external alterations including rear gates. Granted

DM/25/0041 - Retrospective consent for the removal of paint finish from the brick plinth to front bay. Proposed external finish to brick plinth to front bay. Under Consideration

DM/25/0042 - Retrospective consent for the removal of paint finish from the brick plinth to front bay. Proposed external finish to brick plinth to front bay. Under Consideration

DM/25/0093 - Replacement front door. Under Consideration

DM/25/0129 - Conversion and refurbishment of outbuilding for ancillary use. Under Consideration

DM/25/0130 - Conversion and refurbishment of outbuilding for ancillary use. Under Consideration

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site is located on the western side of High Street, within the built up area, Conservation Area, Archaeological Notification Area (Red- Historic Core of Lindfield) of Lindfield. The property is also located within an Article 4 direction, which restricts household permitted development rights in order to retain the character of the area.

The site comprises of No.s 65 and 65a High Street, which is now a single dwellinghouse following the conversion of the previous retail unit to form part of the residential unit, which was granted planning permission and listed building consent under applications DM/23/2304 and DM/23/2298. The property is Grade II* listed along with the attached neighbour No. 63 High Street and dates back to the early 14th century. To the rear of the building is an existing courtyard and garage building with the original Bakehouse building beyond, which has been converted and extension to form a separate retail unit (DM/22/2133).

The property is positioned within the village centre of Lindfield, which is characterised largely by commercial ground floor units on both sides of the highway, with some residential properties in between. As the highway continues to the north, the character of the streetscene changes to predominantly residential. The commercial aspect of the properties along High Street, along with the application properties, forms part of the distinctive character of the village centre and this part of the Conservation Area.

The property has a pitched roof form which extends over the attached neighbour, No. 63 High Street to the south. The roof form above the previous shop portion of the property has a front gable end with a rear gabled roof. The character and appearance of the previous shop unit has been retained with the appearance of two separate front entrances and shopfront window. This retains the character and special interest of the listed building as well as the contribution it makes to the historic core of the Lindfield Conservation Area. The building is constructed at the front with white render, painted brick, and weatherboarding, timber frame and render to the northern side and brick and weatherboarding to the rear. The roof is cladding in plain clay roof tiles with timber windows.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The application seeks listed building consent for the replacement of the front door of the property.

The replacement door proposed is more solid in appearance to the door currently in situ at the property, which has a larger proportion of glazing. The information submitted within the application states that the proposed replacement door has been salvaged from within the property itself, which is suggested to have been an earlier front door which was subsequently replaced with the door that it currently in place.

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 Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) and the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan.

DISTRICT PLAN (adopted 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.

Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan (made March 2016)

None relevant

Mid Sussex Site Allocations Document (DPD)

Mid Sussex District Council adopted its Site Allocations Development Plan Document on 29th June 2022. The Site Allocations DPD identifies sufficient housing sites to provide a five year housing land supply to 2031 and also makes sure that enough land is allocated to meet identified employment needs.

There are no policies deemed relevant to this application.

Other Planning Legislation

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

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 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

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)

ASSESSMENT

The LPA is under a duty by virtue of s.16(2) of the Listed Building and Conservation Area (LBCA) Act 1990 (Decision on application): *'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.'*

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.

Policy DP34 of the District Plan is relevant and states:

'Development will be required to protect listed buildings and their settings. This will be achieved by ensuring that:

- *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;*
- *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;*
- *Traditional building materials and construction techniques are normally used. The installation of uPVC windows and doors will not be acceptable;*
- *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;*
- *Special regard is given to protecting the setting of a listed building;*
- *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.'*

Paras 205, 212-215 of the NPPF state:

'205. 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.*

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.'

Principle DG11 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide states: *'Heritage assets and historic landscapes should be celebrated, enhanced and preserved where appropriate, for the enjoyment of existing and future residents. Where appropriate and providing it does not cause harm to the heritage assets or their setting, they should be carefully integrated into development proposals as they help to reinforce a sense of place and local identity.*

Elsewhere new development should generally reflect the scale of adjacent areas and the settlement context within which it is located to deliver a coherent and consistent urban fabric.

There may be potential to introduce a new character / development form and massing (refer to chapter 5):

- On larger urban extensions; this will typically be within the middle of the site and associated with a new neighbourhood centre, spine road or the main open space.*

- In town centre locations defined as coarse grain areas and nearby sites identified on the brownfield sites register.'*

The Council's Conservation Officer has provided the following comments on the application:

'The Old Bakery is a Grade II listed building located within the Lindfield Conservation Area. The property has a complex recent planning history, but planning and listed building consent have been granted for various internal and external works to the building, including works to the façade facing over*

Lindfield High Street. The current proposal is for a further alteration comprising the replacement of the existing part glazed front door to the shop frontage which is to the northern end of the façade with a solid panelled door, which is said to have been previously in this position before being replaced by the current door.

The existing door does not appear to be of any particular age or architectural significance, but it is sympathetic to the style of the adjacent shop window, and does reflect the former bakery shop use of the northern cross wing of the building. This protracted phase of the building's life is, as recognised in the supporting heritage statement, an important element contributing to its significance. During the course of the previous, now approved, applications, emphasis was placed on the retention of features relating to this phase of the building's life, including the shop window.

The proposed replacement door is domestic in character. It is a solid panelled door with heavy mouldings, described in the application as Georgian. Although there is some anecdotal evidence that this door was previously used in this position, this is not conclusive, and nor is the low resolution photograph provided- the latter to me appears to show a different door, if one compares the position of the letter box, which is half way up the proposed replacement door, but appears below this level in the door shown in the photograph. To me, it seems more likely that the photograph may show the existing door or one of a similar design, painted a dark colour, with stickers applied to one or more of the glazed panels above the letter box- it is however not possible to see the door clearly enough to be sure.

Notwithstanding this, in my opinion the importance of a continued appreciation of the bakery use to the significance is such that it is my opinion that installing a domestic style door which does not relate stylistically to the retained shop window is not appropriate. Although given its modern nature I would not object in principle to the replacement of the existing door, any replacement should however reflect the former commercial use of the north wing of the building, and should also relate appropriately to the adjacent shop window, for example by the retention of glazing in an appropriate pattern to the upper part.

The applicant suggests that the Georgian style door relates well to the remainder of the elevation of the building, which was altered during this period. However despite the alterations which were carried out at this time the appearance of the building's frontage is not one of a polite Georgian façade. I do not therefore find that this is an argument which holds much weight, considered against the harm identified above.

As it stands, I therefore consider that the proposal detracts from the special interest of the listed building, contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34. It is also detracts from the positive contribution that the building makes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, which fails to meet DP35. In both cases I would regard the harm caused to the significance of the affected heritage assets as less than substantial, such that the balancing exercise set out in paragraph 215 of the NPPF will apply.'

The works previously granted to the building has retained the appearance and character of the previous retail unit and use, with the retention of the existing shopfront and door. The adjacent front door to the previous residential portion of the property is no longer functional but has been retained to maintain the character. The existing front door to the previous shop is largely glazed and typical of an entrance to a commercial unit. The proposed replacement door is solid and domestic in appearance, which would significantly alter the appearance of the building. The information submitted with the application states that the proposed door was once the entrance door to the retail unit, however no convincing evidence of this has been provided to show that the proposed door was once in place at the property. A photograph has been submitted as part of the Heritage Statement, and although the photo is dated, it has a similar appearance to the existing door. It is noted by the Conservation Officer that the letterbox positions between the door in the photo and the proposed door are significantly different and not considered to show the same door as proposed.

The Heritage Statement states that the shop front door was not meant to be a feature and was concealed by the fabric canopy. It is noted that the fabric canopy does obscure the door from view from the Google Street View imagery, as included within the statement, however the door would be visible

from the public highway, pedestrians and patrons of the shop. Notwithstanding this, the fabric canopy was retractable and no longer present on the building.

It is considered that the design and appearance of the existing front door contributes to the special character and appearance of the building and its previous commercial use. Due to this the replacement of this door with the proposed solid timber door is considered to detract from the special interest of the listed building, contrary to policy DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan.

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 Heritage Statement states that the replacement door would provide privacy to the occupiers of the dwelling given the proximity of the building to the highway and the high level of pedestrian and vehicular movements. This is considered to be a private matter and would not amount to a public benefit and therefore does not outweigh the harm identified.

CONCLUSION

The special interest of the building would be detracted by the appearance and solid form of replacement door 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.

Decision: Refusal

Case Officer: Katherine Williams