

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/0063	Case Officer:	Andrew Watt
Application Type:	Full Application		
Proposal:	Construction of a first floor extension and access stair at the northern end of the new swimming pool building. Accommodating two classrooms, staff office and ancillary accommodation (part retrospective)		
Site:	Hurstpierpoint College, College Lane, Hurstpierpoint, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9JS, ,		
Validation Date	1 Apr 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	23 Apr 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	27 May 2025
Target Date:	27 May 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	Andrew Watt

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	27 May 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/0063

**Hurstpierpoint College, College Lane, Hurstpierpoint, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9JS,
Construction of a first floor extension and access stair at the northern end of the new swimming
pool building. Accommodating two classrooms, staff office and ancillary accommodation (part
retrospective)
Dan Higgins**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

MSDC Conservation Officer

Original comments:

The application site, Hurstpierpoint College, is an extensive college campus with at its heart a linked pair of Grade II listed buildings- the original quadrangle dating from 1853, and Star House to the east, built as the headmaster's house and dating from 1873. The College campus has developed significantly since its foundation, by incremental additions to the built form around the quadrangle, particularly to the west, north west, and east. The College sits in a rural setting to the north of Hurstpierpoint- this surviving rural setting contributes positively to the historical illustrative value of the listed buildings as a 19th century school deliberately established in a semi-isolated rural position, and to their aesthetic value.

The current proposal, which is partially retrospective, relates to what is in effect an amendment to an existing approval (DM/18/4015) for a new swimming pool building, which is part of a phased redevelopment of campus buildings to the south west of the listed quadrangle, and constitutes the addition of a first floor above the approved single storey northern element of the building.

The proposed additional storey adds height and bulk to the approved building, but in the context of the existing collection of buildings to this part of the campus is not in principle considered to detract from the setting of the listed buildings. The proposed contemporary design also relates to the other modern buildings in the vicinity. Based on the submitted information and our discussions on site yesterday I do however have some concerns regarding aspects of the detailed treatment of the extension:

- Although the submitted plans show plant to the roof of the addition, it seems that in practice this installation and the surrounding enclosure will be larger than shown. The proposed plans should be amended to show the updated arrangement- it will also be useful if these plans and/or supporting documents can be annotated to show the facing materials to the extension, including the plant enclosure.
- I would also suggest that sectional drawings should be provided to show the plant and enclosure in the context of the parapet surrounding the roof. My concern is that the enclosure should not impinge unduly on longer views of the building, or views from upper storeys of surrounding buildings including the listed quadrangle.
- As we discussed on site, the proposed manufactured Rockpanel cladding to the façade of the extension may be considered contentious in this sensitive, semi-rural context, in close proximity to listed buildings of a traditional construction. It will be helpful to have more information including images of the proposed cladding, but it should be noted that it may be that we consider that a more natural material, such as timber cladding similar to that present on adjacent buildings, should be substituted for this.

I can provide further comments on receipt of this additional information.

Updated comments:

Further comments on the above application following the receipt of further and revised information.

The plans have been revised to provide an up to date indication of the scale of the plant and surrounding enclosure to the roof of the building. Although the enclosure is fairly substantial, I am satisfied on the basis of these drawings that it will not appear unduly prominent in views of the pool building, given the context of the other surrounding campus buildings.

I remain concerned, however, regarding the use of the Rockpanel cladding to the upper floor of the extension, and would suggest that this should be amended to natural timber cladding to match that to the existing adjacent buildings. This could perhaps be done by condition.

On balance, therefore, the proposal is considered acceptable in principle in terms of the impact on the settings of the adjacent listed buildings, but further/revised information is required in terms of the facing materials.

I would recommend the following conditions:

- Details of facing and roofing materials, including to the plant enclosure
- Detailed drawings, including sections, at an appropriate large scale, annotated to show materials and finishes, of the following:
 - Typical examples of windows and external doors. Your drawings should as appropriate show glazing bar detail and depth of reveal.
 - Typical parapet detail
 - Typical porch hood detail
- New rainwater goods and other external pipework to be of painted metal

TOWN / PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Original comment:

The committee's recommendation is that MSDC should give permission.

Updated comment:

The committee had no further comment.

INTRODUCTION

Full planning permission is sought for the construction of a first-floor extension and access stair at the northern end of the new swimming pool building, accommodating two classrooms, staff office and ancillary accommodation with proposed screening to plant on roof (part retrospective).

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

In January 2019, planning permission was granted for the demolition of an existing theatre building and several single storey extensions to a boarding house (Eagle House) and construction of a new double height swimming pool building with single storey projection to the north and landscaping works (DM/18/4015). This permission has largely been implemented as part of the Phase 1 works and is nearing completion.

In May 2020, a Lawful Development Certificate was granted to demonstrate that a lawful start had been made in implementing planning permission DM/18/4015, for a swimming pool building.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The site is located south-west of the main quadrangle of College buildings and Star House, which are both Grade II listed, and forms part of the southern edge of a more modern quadrangle, together with student accommodation immediately east at Eagle House and the redundant swimming pool building adjacent to the west and the larger gymnasium building behind it. The western part of this quadrangle is

enclosed by the Performing Arts Centre (two buildings) and the northern part by a classroom building. Land levels fall from north to south.

The site (and the wider College campus) is located within the countryside to the north of Hurstpierpoint and within a designated Great Crested Newt - Impact Risk Zone (Red).

APPLICATION DETAILS

The application is for the construction of a first-floor extension and access stair at the northern end of the new swimming pool building, to accommodate two classrooms, staff office and ancillary accommodation with proposed screening to plant on roof. Works are well underway, so the application is partly retrospective. This represents the final part of Phase 1 of the works to implement the new swimming pool building, which included a single-storey angled projection to the north, but this elevation was unresolved without the first floor. The Phase 2 works will be to demolish the redundant swimming pool building (demolition application DM/25/1068 approved on 21 May 2025) and gymnasium building and provide a new Sports Complex building, with sports hall and stores immediately to the west of the swimming pool and an angled 2-storey projection to the front, extending the angled projection already begun under Phase 1.

The first floor extension will take the maximum height of the building to approximately 9.2m, depending on ground level, plus an additional 1.3m for the set back plant enclosure. The proposal also includes a new external access stair, measuring approximately 3m in width by 11.6m in length, to a maximum height of 8.8m (dependent on ground level). This has been built on a former area of hardstanding, which has also been a building site more recently. No additional external works or landscaping are proposed.

Materials will be Highcliffe Weathered Buff coloured brickwork and Rainscreen cladding in Rockpanel Woods Carbon Oak, with a single ply flat roof membrane, coloured grey, and powder coated aluminium windows and external doors in mid grey RAL 7015.

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 Mid Sussex District Plan, Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) and the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan.

National policy (which is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Practice Guidance) does not form part of the development plan, but is an important material consideration.

Mid Sussex District Plan (Mar 2018)

The Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031 was adopted at Full Council on 28 March 2018.

Relevant policies:

Policy DP12: Protection and Enhancement of Countryside
Policy DP25: Community Facilities and Local Services
Policy DP26: Character and Design
Policy DP34: Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets
Policy DP38: Biodiversity

Site Allocations DPD

The SADPD was adopted on 29 June 2022. It allocates sufficient housing and employment land to meet identified needs to 2031.

There are no relevant policies.

Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan (Mar 2015)

Mid Sussex District Council formally 'made' the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan part of the Local Development Plan for the Parish of Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common as of 18 March 2015. The policies contained therein carry full weight as part of the Development Plan for planning decisions within Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common.

Relevant policies:

Policy HurstC1: Conserving and Enhancing Character

Policy HurstC5: Hurstpierpoint College

Other Legislation

Countryside and Rights of Way (CROW) Act 2000

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 the Stage 1 hearings were concluded on 31 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:

DPS2: Sustainable Design and Construction

DPN2: Biodiversity Net Gain

DPC1: Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside

DPB1: Character and Design

DPB2: Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets

DPI6: Community and Cultural Facilities and Local Services

Mid Sussex Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (Nov 2020)

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 4 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.

Relevant design principles include:

Principle DG11: Respond to the existing townscape, heritage assets and historic landscape

Principle DG37: Deliver high quality buildings that minimise their environmental impact

Principle DG38: Design buildings with architectural integrity and a sense of place

Principle DG39: Deliver appropriately scaled buildings

Principle DG44: Design of commercial buildings

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (Dec 2024)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 is also a material consideration and paragraphs 8 (overarching objectives), 11 (presumption in favour of sustainable development), 96 (achieving healthy, inclusive and safe places and beautiful buildings), 98 (social, recreational and cultural facilities and services), 101 (public service infrastructure), 131 and 135 (design), 187 (conserving and enhancing the natural environment), 193 (biodiversity and ancient woodland) and 202-221 (heritage assets) are considered to be relevant to this application.

ASSESSMENT

Design and visual impact on the character and appearance of the area

Policy DP12 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states (in part):

'The countryside will be protected in recognition of its intrinsic character and beauty. Development will be permitted in the countryside, defined as the area outside of built-up area boundaries on the Policies Map, provided it maintains or where possible enhances the quality of the rural and landscape character of the District, and:

- *it is necessary for the purposes of agriculture; or*
- *it is supported by a specific policy reference either elsewhere in the Plan, a Development Plan Document or relevant Neighbourhood Plan.'*

Policy HurstC1 of the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan is similar in intent:

'Development, including formal sports and recreation areas, will be permitted in the countryside, where:

- *It comprises an appropriate countryside use;*
- *It maintains or where possible enhances the quality of the rural and landscape character of the Parish area;*

In the South Downs National Park, policy HurstC2 will take precedent.'

The application is not necessary for the purposes of agriculture but is supported by Policies DP25 and DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, and Policy HurstC5 of the Neighbourhood Plan.

Policy DP25 of the Mid Sussex District Plan includes gyms, sports halls, swimming pools and fitness facilities and states (in part):

'The provision or improvement of community facilities and local services that contribute to creating sustainable communities will be supported.'

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states (in part):

'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;'*

Policy HurstC5 of the Neighbourhood Plan states:

'Development will be permitted within the environs of Hurstpierpoint College where:

- *It does not detract from the special architectural character and appearance of the existing collection of buildings and their setting in the landscape;*
- *It conserves or enhances the character and appearance of Listed Buildings;*
- *It complies with the requirements of Policy C1;*

- *It enhances the role of the College as a school and local employer.'*

Chapter 6 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD relates to high quality and sustainable building design and Design Principle DG44 seeks to ensure that employment buildings respond positively to the character and architectural traditions of the District in terms of scale, mass, form, materials and detailing.

In principle, the enhancement of existing swimming pool building is supported by the above policies and guidance. In addition, the proposed extension is considered to be of an appropriate scale and design in relation to the existing swimming pool building.

Accordingly, it is considered that the proposal would comply with Policies DP25 and DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policies HurstC1 and HurstC5 of the Neighbourhood Plan and the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD.

Impact on the setting of the Listed Buildings

Hurstpierpoint College contains two designated heritage assets, being Grade II listed buildings.

Section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states that:

'In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, 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.'

Policy DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states (in part):

'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.'*

Design Principle 11 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD seeks to ensure that heritage assets are enhanced and preserved where appropriate.

Paragraphs 207, 208, 210, 212 and 215 of the NPPF are relevant, as follows:

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.

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.*

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.

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.

The Council's Conservation Officer has on balance considered the proposal acceptable in principle, but has suggested conditions be imposed regarding the materials (cladding in particular) and design details. Subject to these conditions, it is concluded that the proposed works are acceptable in preserving or enhancing the setting of the listed building. Accordingly, the scheme would comply with Policy DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policy HurstC5 of the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan and paragraph 210 of the NPPF.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states (in part):

'All applicants will be required to demonstrate 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)'*

The nearest residential property is the student accommodation at Eagle House adjacent to the east. However, given that the implementation of the swimming pool building is already taking place, it is not considered that any further impact will arise. An informative is included to ensure that works take place during normal construction hours.

Accordingly, the scheme would comply with Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan.

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 development below the de-minimis threshold meaning that this development is exempt from providing biodiversity net gain.

Other matters

The site is located within a designated Great Crested Newt - Impact Risk Zone (Red). However, having regard to the nature of the application, it is unlikely to have an impact on newts and accordingly there would be no conflict with the above legislation, policy and guidance.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

The proposed extension is considered to be of an appropriate scale and design in relation to the existing swimming pool building and will not harm the setting of the listed buildings to the north-east. It would not cause significant detriment to surrounding students / staff on campus, and there would be no harm to biodiversity. Accordingly it is considered that the development complies with Policies DP12, DP25, DP26, DP34 and DP38 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policies HurstC1 and HurstC5 of the Hurstpierpoint and Sayers Common Neighbourhood Plan, the Mid Sussex Design Guide SPD and the NPPF, in particular paragraph 210, and is therefore considered acceptable.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Andrew Watt