

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/2963	Case Officer:	Emily Wade
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent		
Proposal:	Retrospective application for replacement roof tiling.		
Site:	Lemon Meadow, Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 4EY, ,		
Validation Date	18 Nov 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	26 Dec 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	9 Jan 2026
Target Date:	13 Jan 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	Emily Wade

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	13 Jan 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/2963

**Lemon Meadow, Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 4EY,
Retrospective application for replacement roof tiling.
Mr Alec Ferguson**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

N/A

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Defer to officer.

INTRODUCTION

Lemon Meadow is one half of a Grade II listed building located in a semi-rural position outside Crawley Down. The current application, which is retrospective, is for the replacement of the roof tiles.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/18/1606 Listed building consent granted for the replacement of the existing clay roof tiles with sahtas restoration mix tiles, as used on extensions to the properties. Roof strengthening works as specified by structural engineer.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Lemon Meadow is (with its attached neighbour Yew Tree Cottage) on half of a Grade II listed building located in a semi-rural position outside Crawley Down. The building, which dates according to the list description to the 16th century is of timber framed construction with a clay tiled roof.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The current proposal, which is retrospective, is for the replacement of the roof tiles to Lemon Meadow. Listed building consent was previously granted in 2018 for replacement of the previously existing tiles with new tiles (Sahtas Restoration Mix), alongside structural repairs to the roof. However, following rapid progressive failure of the Sahtas tiles as installed the roof was again stripped, and the Sahtas tiles replaced with new handmade Keymer Goxhill Dark Chestnut tiles. The current application seeks to regularise the use of this alternative product.

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 Allocation Development Plan Document (DPD) and the Crawley Down 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.

There are no relevant policies.

Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan

None relevant.

Other Material Considerations

Mid Sussex District Plan 2021-2039 Consultation 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 stage 1 hearings were concluded on the 31st October 2024. There are unresolved objections to the majority of 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 2023)

Paragraphs 210-215 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.*

211. *In considering any applications to remove or alter a historic statue, plaque, memorial or monument (whether listed or not), local planning authorities should have regard to the importance of their retention in situ and, where appropriate, of explaining their historic and social context rather than removal.*

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:...

- Alterations or extensions to a listed building respect its historic form, scale, setting, significance and fabric...'*

The current proposal, which is retrospective, is for the replacement of the roof tiles to Lemon Meadow. Listed building consent was previously granted in 2018 for replacement of the previously existing tiles with new tiles (Sahtas Restoration Mix), alongside structural repairs to the roof. However, following rapid progressive failure of the Sahtas tiles as installed the roof was again stripped, and the Sahtas tiles replaced with new handmade Keymer Goxhill Dark Chestnut tiles. The current application seeks to regularise the use of this alternative product.

The applicant has provided supporting information as justification for the change in materials, and while it is regrettable that the application is retrospective, the alternative tile type which has been used to replace the failed Sahtas tiles is considered appropriate to the context.

The proposal is therefore considered to preserve the special interest of the listed building, meeting the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

It should be noted that the tiles were replaced across the entire building, including the attached neighbour Yew Tree Cottage. The current proposal however does not include Yew Tree Cottage; it is understood that the owner of that property will be submitting a separate application in this respect.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

It recommended that listed building consent is granted.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Emily Wade