

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/0130	Case Officer:	Katherine Williams
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent		
Proposal:	Conversion and refurbishment of outbuilding for ancillary use.		
Site:	The Old Bakery, 65 And 65A High Street, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2HN, ,		
Validation Date	15 Jan 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	21 Feb 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	7 Mar 2025
Target Date:	12 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/25/0130

**The Old Bakery, 65 And 65A High Street, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2HN,
Conversion and refurbishment of outbuilding for ancillary use.**

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 conversion and refurbishment of outbuilding for ancillary use.

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/25/0131 - Replacement front door. Under Consideration

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site is located on the western side of the 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 outbuilding 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 in white render, painted brick, and weatherboarding, timber frame and render to the northern side and brick and weatherboarding to the rear. The roof is clad in plain clay roof tiles with timber windows.

The existing garage outbuilding is located to the rear of the property and the attached neighbour, No. 63 High Street, and to the south of No. 65B High Street, a retail unit. The building has a pitched gable roof with a front lean-to projection which includes garage doors. The building is constructed in brick and brick.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposed conversion of the building would create a one bedroom annex with the bedroom on a first floor mezzanine and a ground floor shower room and living area on the ground floor. The conversion would result in the removal of the existing front lean to projection with an oak door and panel. The existing window and rooflight would also be replaced, along with re-roofing and replacement black metal rainwater goods.

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

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.

Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan (made March 2016)

None relevant

Other Legislation

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

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 one half of a Grade II* listed building located within the Lindfield Conservation Area. The property has a complex recent planning history including unauthorised works, but planning and listed building consent have been granted for various internal and external works to the building. The current proposal relates to a detached outbuilding to the rear which is regarded as curtilage listed.'

Although in the same ownership as The Old Bakery, it is actually located behind the other half of the listed building (Wincote).

The current proposal, which follows on from pre-application advice, is for alterations to the building in conjunction with converting it for use as ancillary residential accommodation.

The submitted historic building assessment considers that the building dates from the early 19th century. It has a rectangular plan with a shallow projection to its northern side which the HBA suggests may be either the remains of an enclosure, or a particularly well integrated extension to provide sufficient depth to allow for parking of a car within the building. The projection does not appear on early maps of the building. Originally, it is suggested that the building was used as a stables, with a fully floored hay loft over. This loft was externally accessed via a loading door to the eastern gable, with an adapted roof truss to allow for this, and had a further modified central truss to allow access along its entire length as one space. At ground floor, no evidence of stall partitioning remains, but it is suggested that this may have taken the form of a second fit within the external envelope. Later alterations to the building include insertion of a stair between ground and attic floors, replacement of the window to the northern elevation, and a rooflight to the roof slope above this.

The outbuilding is of some interest in its own right as a good example of a small stable building of the early 19th century. It also contributes positively to the setting of the principal listed building, an in particular is illustrative of a particular period of the building's development, and its composite domestic/commercial use at that time.

To consider the various works proposed in turn:

- *Externally, to the courtyard facing north elevation it is proposed to remove the projection around the entrance, and infill the opening with a new glazed timber framed door and adjacent solid timber panel. It is also proposed to replace the existing concrete lintel with timber. Although the HBA cannot be certain about the age or level of interest of this projection, it seems likely that even if original (contrary to the map evidence) it is a fragmentary remainder of a larger enclosure. As such, I would have no objection in principle to its removal. The proposal in relation to the infilling of the opening are not considered contentious, subject to detail.*
- *The proposed replacement oak framed casement window and rooflight to this elevation are also not considered contentious, subject to detail.*
- *To the eastern elevation it is proposed to replace the existing infilling to the loft loading door with timber cladding painted to match the rest of the elevation. Internally the lining system will be recessed to continue to allow the presence of the opening to be appreciated. This is not considered contentious.*
- *This elevation is to be repainted with a breathable paint- this is also not considered contentious.*
- *Re-roofing, re-pointing and replacement guttering are not considered contentious subject to detail.*
- *I would suggest that further information on the treatment of the existing pigeon holes to the western gable is required by condition- these should continue to be legible*
- *Internally, the building as noted above was originally fully floored. The reinstatement of an attic floor structure is not therefore considered contentious in principle.*
- *The proposed replacement staircase is in a different position to the existing ladder stair, which is in itself not original. This will result in some loss of historic fabric, but is considered acceptable in principle. It is noted that the interrupted truss structure is to be retained exposed, which is a positive aspect of the scheme.*
- *Partitioning is proposed at ground floor level to create a bathroom. This will have some impact on the existing open layout of the building, but given the likelihood that partitioning for stalls or loose boxes was previously present, this aspect of the proposal is not considered contentious. I would however suggest that the applicant be asked to confirm that the new facilities will not involve any new external pipework, soil stacks etc. which are not shown on the elevations?*
- *The proposal includes details of proposed insulation to the walls and roof of the building, and to the underside of the attic floor structure, as well as of a new floating floor at ground floor level. These details are all acceptable, although the applicant should please confirm if any alteration to the rafter feet at eaves level will be required?*

The proposal is therefore considered, subject to the points in bold above, and to the suggested conditions below, to preserve the special interest of the curtilage listed building and the contribution

which it makes to the setting of the adjacent principal listed building, and to the character and appearance of the Lindfield Conservation Area. This meets the requirements of District Plan Policies DP34 and DP35 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

I would suggest the following conditions:

- *New rooflight to be a flush fitting, metal framed, conservation style rooflight.*
- *New rainwater goods to be of painted metal.*
- *Details of new roofing tile.*
- *Details of the treatment of the existing openings to the western gable for the pigeon loft. Your detailed drawings/methodology should show how these openings will be infilled in a manner which continues to express their presence, and should include detail of materials.'*

Following these comments further information to address the questions raised have been received and the responses are considered acceptable. In addition to this, information has been provided regarding details of the new roof tiles and the treatment of the Pigeon Holes to the western elevation which are considered to be acceptable and additional conditions are no longer required.

The conversion and associated works are considered to be proportionate and appropriate to the existing outbuilding and its relationship with the host listed building. The proposed alterations would retain the existing ancillary character of the building and would preserve the special interest of the curtilage listed building and the contribution it makes to the setting of the host listed building. It is considered that with suitable conditions, the proposal would be appropriate to the character of the property and would not have a harmful impact upon the special interest of the listed building.

CONCLUSION

The special interest of the building will therefore be preserved by the works. As a result, the proposal complies with policy DP34 of the District Plan, as well as the requirements of both the NPPF and the Listed Building and Conservation Area (LBCA) Act 1990.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Katherine Williams