

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/3073	Case Officer:	Andrew Horrell
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent		
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/25/3073

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

Listed building consent 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:

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.

Relevant policies.

None relevant.

Neighbourhood Plan

The Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan was formally made on 23 March 2016

Relevant policies:

None relevant

Other Legislation

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Other Material Considerations

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.

Mid Sussex District Plan 2021-2039 Submission Draft

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:

DPB2 Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024)

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.'

Section 16 (2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states:

'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.'

ASSESSMENT

District Plan Policy DP34 will be relevant, and 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 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 association between The Coach House which was converted to residential use from a previous stable block under F/68/40 and Nether Walstead which is some 40m to the south-west, both 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 is 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.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the proposal would preserve the special interest of the curtilage listed building and setting of Grade II listed Nether Walstead and thereby meet the requirements of Policy DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

It is recommended that listed building consent is granted.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Andrew Horrell