

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/3072	Case Officer:	Andrew Horrell
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Construction of link extension, external and internal alterations to building.		
Site:	The Coach House, Nether Walstead, East Mascalls Lane, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2QJ,		
Validation Date	12 Dec 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	18 Jun 2026
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	27 Jul 2026
Target Date:	6 Feb 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Andrew Horrell

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	28 Jul 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/3072

The Coach House, Nether Walstead, East Mascalls Lane, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2QJ

**Construction of link extension, external and internal alterations to building.
Teresa Lake & Edward Ball**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

MSDC Conservation Officer: Alterations to shed and Coach House acceptable subject to detail, link structure whilst in principle not contentious is over scaled and inappropriate in form.

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No comment

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought for the construction of link extension, external and internal alterations to the building and the installation of metal gate.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None relevant

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The Coach House is a hipped roofed detached dwelling, the walls are a mix of face brickwork and timber cladding and upvc doors and windows, The detached shed to the north-west of the Coach House is a pitched roofed timber clad wood shed.

To the north of the site is the garden area with wood shed and brick wall to courtyard serving garage, to the south of the site is a brick wall and hedging to grounds of Nether Walstead beyond, to the east of the site is the access path with neighbouring cottages (The Cottage, Hindover and Keepers Cottage) beyond and to the west of the site is a brick wall to driveway beyond.

The site is situated within the countryside as defined in the District and Neighbourhood Plans.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposed link hallway extension between the Coach House and converted barn measures approximately 2.95m in depth, 2m in width with eaves and ridge height to match the converted shed (2.05m and 3.7m). It will be served by front and rear doors.

The existing shed is to be converted into a kitchen and pantry. A rear and double timber doors, glazed infill set between retained timber posts and front triple timber doors. The existing roof is to be renovated as are the timber cladding boards.

External and Internal alterations are proposed to the Coach House. Throughout the uPVC windows where replaced are changed to timber, the first floor uPVC cladding replaced with timber weatherboarding and the existing uPVC rainwater goods changed to metal.

External works to the western elevation include on the ground floor existing door replaced by a timber window, existing window replaced to timber casement window and French doors replaced by timber doors and window to garage replaced by timber doors. On the first floor the windows replaced and one set of hallway windows removed and infilled with painted timber lapped weatherboarding cladding to match existing.

On the eastern elevation, on the ground floor the garage and front doors will be infilled with clay brick in mortar to match the existing, the existing windows replaced with timber casement window. On the first floor the set of windows reduced from four to two with removed windows infilled by painted timber lapped weatherboarding cladding to match existing and retained windows to be replaced.

On the southern side elevation, the existing rainwater goods moved to the west and eastern elevations and ground floor only on the southern elevation. The existing windows replaced by taller windows.

On the northern side elevation, an additional first floor window to serve the bathroom with existing windows to be replaced.

Internal works include on the ground floor the kitchen changed to a lounge, the gym changed to a living room and the garage altered to a bedroom. On the first floor, the hallway turned round from the west to east side with the existing landing altered to a dressing room and the hallway and bathroom and bedroom swapped.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND LIST OF POLICIES

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 the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural 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:

DP12 - Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside
DP21 - Transport
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.

Neighbourhood Plan

The Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan was formally made on 23 March 2016.
Relevant policies:

None relevant

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 hearings were concluded on 19th March 2026. The District Plan remains at Examination until the Inspector has published his report, until that time 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:

DPC1 - Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside
DPB1 - Character and Design
DPB2 - Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets
DPT4 - Parking and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure

Mid Sussex Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

The Council is currently in the process of adopting 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 has been through public consultation and the Scrutiny Committee for Housing, Planning and Economic Growth have recommended to Council its adoption as an SPD for use in the consideration and determination of planning applications. While not yet adopted, it is considered that this document carries weight and is a material consideration in the determination of the application.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 is a material consideration. Paragraphs 8, 11, 131, 135, 210, 212, 213, 214 and 215 are considered to be relevant to this application.

ASSESSMENT

Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside

DP12 of the Mid Sussex District Plan in part states:

'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.'*

Given the domestic nature of the proposal, the proposal is deemed to protect the rural character of the area. The proposal therefore complies with DP12 of the Mid Sussex District Plan.

Character and Design

DP26 of the 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;
- 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'

Principle DG49 states:

'Extensions should respond to the design of the original dwelling and applicant will be expected to demonstrate how local character has informed the design proposal. Extensions should also normally be designed to be well integrated with the existing scale, form and massing allow the original building to remain the dominant element of the property whether it has one or several additions.

Extensions should typically use simple, uncomplicated building forms to complement and coordinate with the scale, form and massing of the original dwelling. The design approach may benefit from coordinating with the existing pattern of window and door openings as well as employing facing materials to match those of the existing dwelling. Otherwise, it should demonstrate the appropriateness of the alternative approach.

Extensions should not result in a significant loss to the private amenity area of the dwelling.

There are two general approaches to extending a property:

- designing in the style of the existing building by closely matching its facing materials, architectural features, window sizes and proportions; and
- designing in a contemporary style that takes its cues from key aspects of the existing building that might include its underlying form and proportions, facing materials, window design and other specific architectural features. The success of this approach is particularly reliant on high quality facing materials and finishes, and this will normally need to be demonstrated through detailed elevations and section drawings.

Both approaches can create successful, well designed extensions that can be mutually beneficial to both the house and the wider area. All extensions and alterations should consider their impact on neighbouring properties (refer to Chapter 8 on residential amenity).'

Design Guide Principle DG50 refers to Side extensions and states:

'Side extensions are typically visible from the public realm and will be resisted where they have an adverse impact on the street scene or the appearance of a dwelling.

Side extensions

Side extensions should normally be subservient to the original dwelling and typically be set-back from the front of the house to help define the original building.

The gaps between dwellings can sometimes positively contribute to articulating (for example, through the consistent rhythm of repeated houses) and adding interest in a street frontage or by providing views / visible connections to the surrounding countryside. Side extensions will therefore need to appropriately respond to the character of the street form and will not normally be accepted where they close an important gap and view'.

The external works to the Coach House are deemed in character with the existing dwelling with the use of weatherboard cladding and timber casement windows more suitable for a historic rural building than the existing more modern uPVC.

The proposed external works to the shed to allow for conversion to residential usage as in effect an extension to the Coach House is deemed in character with the alteration to glazing to allow for prominence of the original timber posts to be kept.

The proposed link is in effect deemed a side extension, in terms of DG50 the extension is in keeping with the existing shed, it is subservient to the Coach House and uses sympathetic materials. It is therefore deemed in character with the site.

Therefore, in terms of character and design the proposal complies with DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, principles DG49 and DG50 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Impact on the setting of the listed building

Nether Walstead It is situated in substantial grounds in rural position outside the village of Lindfield. The coach House is a converted dwelling within the grounds to the north-west of Nether Walstead and is seen within its setting as is the shed, given their historic linkage with the main house.

As such the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is relevant to the consideration of the application. S. 66 states:

'66.—(1) 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.'

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.'*

Policy DP34 of the District Plan relates to Listed Buildings. It states that:

'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.'*

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 210, 212-215 of the NPPF are relevant and state that:

'210. In determining planning applications, local planning authorities should take account of:
o *the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*
o *the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and*
o *the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.*

Considering potential impacts

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* 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;*
- c) and conservation by grant-funding or some form of 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.'

The Conservation Officer to the original plans stated the following:

"Nether Walstead is a Grade II listed building, a former farmhouse which was significantly extended in the early 20th century to form a country house of some pretension. The former farm buildings of the farmstead appear to have been located to the northeast of the house, ranged around a series of yards. A small number of historic buildings survive in this area. The Coach House is a two-storey brick and clad building which appears on historical maps dating from the 19th century and would be regarded as curtilage listed, although it is noted that the structure was apparently substantially rebuilt during the later 20th century. A single storey timber framed and weatherboarded structure known as The Shed sits to the northwest of this.

The current proposal, which is partly retrospective, is for works to the Coach House and Shed comprising construction of a link extension, internal and external alterations, and retention of a sliding

metal gate which has been installed the southeast of the buildings. These applications follow on from pre-application advice.

With respect to the Coach House itself, externally it is proposed to remove the existing uPVC cladding to the upper floor, make adjustments to window openings, infill the existing garage door opening, install replacement windows, and carry out other minor works. Internally, existing partitions would be removed to allow for a reconfigured plan form.

In principle, given the level of existing alterations to the building, these works are not considered contentious. The removal of uPVC cladding, uPVC windows and the garage door has the potential to enhance the appearance of the building and its contribution to the setting of Nether Walstead. However, I would recommend that the window design is amended to better reflect the traditional nature of the original building and its evolved domestic appearance- multi-pane casements will in this context be preferable to the large pane casements shown. Conditions would be required on any eventual permission relating to details of materials and the detailed design of windows and external doors.

A linking structure is proposed between the Coach House and the Shed. The principle of this was discussed at pre-application stage and considered acceptable. However, the design as submitted raises a number of concerns:

- The footprint and bulk of the structure is excessive due to the inclusion of a covered porch under a metal standing seam roof to the northern side. This element of the proposal is unnecessary and should be omitted. If the porch is considered necessary as a result of the relocation of the principle entrance to the link structure, this may also require reconsideration.*
- The link itself is not the lightweight largely glazed structure which was anticipated following pre-application advice. This applies to both elevations, but particularly to the southern side, and to the roof. This reduces the sense of separation between the Coach House and Shed. The design and materials of the structure require reconsideration.*

The Shed is a 19th century timber framed and weatherboarded structure with a clay tiled roof. A brief historical map regression exercise suggests that it was originally open on its southern side, suggesting use as a cattle or cart shed- however as it faced onto a yard, the latter is more likely. More recently, the southern elevation has been infilled with brickwork and an opening formed in the weatherboarding to its northern elevation to allow use for storage.

The current proposal to convert the building for residential use as an annexe to the Coach House is not considered contentious in principle. However, in my opinion aspects of the associated works would benefit from amendment, or further information:

- As noted at pre-application stage, it will be better for fenestration etc. to reflect existing or historic openings to the building. Although the fenestration to the northern side does sit within the existing opening, to the south new windows of a domestic appearance are shown sitting within the existing brickwork infill to the originally open elevation, which has been previously inserted between the retained original timber posts. It will be better if one or more openings are formed to this elevation which fully open up one or more bays of the structure, with an appropriately framed glazed infill- this approach could reinstate something of the building's original appearance, whereas the fenestration currently shown is domestic in its character and detracts from the surviving agricultural nature of The Shed. This aspect of the proposal requires reconsideration, and if necessary, the internal layout rethought accordingly.*
- Further information should be provided regarding the proposed method of insulation to floor, walls and roof of the building. I would prefer to see this now rather than by condition, as it will be fundamental to the practical implementation of the scheme. We will need to see detailed typical elevations and sections which demonstrate how historic fabric which is of interest, such as the timber framing to the roof and some of the walls of the building, is retained and exposed to view.*

Further detail will also be required of the repair work noted to the timber framed structure of the building. It is understood that the extent and nature of these repairs may not become apparent until the cladding and roof tiles are removed; however the applicant should be aware that work would need to cease at this

point to allow for the submission and consideration of a detailed condition report and schedule of works, which could be required by condition on any eventual approval.

The new metal gate, which is already in place, is located sitting across the driveway to the southeast of the coach house. It is a solid metal vehicular gate which opens on a sliding mechanism. Planning permission was granted in 2025 for a timber panelled side hung pedestrian gate with an adjacent short section of timber panelled fencing in this location, as well as further gates and gate posts along the main entrance driveway. None of these gates and gate posts have been installed according to the planning permission- the remaining unauthorised works are currently subject of a separate pre-application enquiry.

Whilst in the context of the existing approval there is no objection in principle to a new gate in this location, the design and materials of the gate as installed are not sympathetic to the context. Due to its materials and finish and its opening mechanism the gate has a starkly contemporary, urban appearance which is not appropriate for the rural setting of the listed house and curtilage listed former agricultural buildings. It should be removed, and this application amended to show a gate of a more appropriate design and materials, such as a side hung five bar timber gate, which would allow vehicular access if required, or a pedestrian gate similar to that already approved.

In summary, although the principle of the proposals is not considered contentious, as been established through pre-application advice or in the case of the gate by an existing planning permission, the detail of the scheme as submitted requires some reconsideration and amendment in order to ensure that the special interests of curtilage listed structures and, through impact on setting, of Nether Walstead house are preserved".

Following amended plans where the proposed gates were removed and design of the shed altered the Conservation Officer stated the following:

"the glazed pattern was deemed acceptable subject to detail, in terms of the link I would not consider it appropriate to extend the Shed in a manner which is such that the form and footprint of the historic building are obscured, as would be the case if the roof were to be extended as shown. I remain of the opinion that as shown the link is overscaled and inappropriate in form, and that the substantial porch element should be omitted and the design of the link itself amended in favour of a simple glazed link as discussed at pre-application. The amendment to the infilled between the retained timber posts to the she is acceptable, the insulation works are acceptable and the repair approach is acceptable in principle subject to condition."

As noted above given the historic associated between The Coach House which was converted to residential use from stable block under F/68/40 and Nether Walstead which is some 40m to the south-west, the Coach House and Shed are deemed curtilage listed.

The changes to the Coach House including the change from uPVC doors and windows to timber and uPVC cladding to timber weatherboarding are deemed to improve the existing curtilage listed building, the majority of the works to the shed are deemed acceptable subject to details. The conversion of the existing shed to residential usage for the Coach House allows for a viable use and allow for its long-term retention given it is accepted that its roof is in very poor condition.

The Conservation Officer has concerns about the link between the Shed and Coach House. In the planning officers view given its location and the fact that it agreed that the principle of a link is accepted, it retains the simple utilitarian rural building character it will have a neutral impact on the special character of the curtilage listed building and the setting of the Grade II listed Nether Walstead.

Therefore, the proposal is deemed to comply with DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

Parking Standards

With the addition of removal of the existing garage and the creation of an additional bedroom, parking standards have to be assessed. The dwelling as proposed has 4 bedrooms. West Sussex County

Council August 2019 Parking Standards Guidance outlines that for a 4-bedroom dwelling in this location that 2.7 parking spaces has to be provided.

At least two off street parking spaces can be provided within the existing driveway with the detached garage available for use. Therefore, the proposed is deemed to comply with policy DP21 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, and the WSCC Parking Standards Guidance.

Residential Amenity

Policy DP26 of the District Plan requires developments to demonstrate that it does not cause significant harm to amenities of existing nearby residents (or future occupiers), taking into account matters such as impact on light, privacy and outlook.

Given the distance to neighbouring properties, with The Cottage some 10m at the closest point and Nether Walstead some 40m at the closest point there will be no harm to outlook and light.

Given the alterations to the Coach House the level of overlooking towards the Cottage will be no more harmful than the existing arrangement which has first floor windows on the front (eastern) and side (northern) elevations. Whilst the alterations to the shed to residential usage will create openings which will allow for some degree of impact, as only a single storey structure with no direct viewpoints towards The Cottage, the level of harm is not deemed significant.

Given the distance to Nether Walstead no harm in terms of overlooking and privacy is deemed to be caused. Therefore, in terms of neighbouring amenities the proposal is deemed to comply with 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. As a householder application, this development is exempt from the requirement to provide biodiversity net gain.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the proposal would accord with the requirements of policies DP12, DP21, DP26 and DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, the Mid Sussex Design Guide and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF. It is therefore considered acceptable.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Andrew Horrell