

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/2983	Case Officer:	Stefan Galyas
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent		
Proposal:	Proposed single storey extension and internal alterations. Demolish existing single storey.		
Site:	1 Old Church Cottages, Church Lane, Horsted Keynes, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 7AY, ,		
Validation Date	20 Nov 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	26 Dec 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	12 Jan 2026
Target Date:	15 Jan 2026	Recommending Officer Signature:	<i>Stefan Galyas</i>

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

Signed and Agreed By:	<i>Stephen Ashdown</i>	Date:	13 Jan 2026
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/2983

**1 Old Church Cottages, Church Lane, Horsted Keynes, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 7AY,
Proposed single storey extension and internal alterations. Demolish existing single storey.
Mr Guy Bowen**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

There were no letters of representation received in response to the current proposal.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Conservation Officer:

The current proposal represents a further decrease in the footprint of the proposed side addition (in comparison to previous applications) and also reflects a reconsideration of its form and detailing, introducing a stepped footprint and full height glazing to the rear element (the proposed dining area) - although the extension would still represent an increase in footprint and bulk over the existing side addition, these aspects of the current proposal should assist in further reducing its apparent scale. The cumulative impact of the proposed extension and existing two storey rear addition remains to my mind somewhat problematic, however, on balance, the current proposal, which is very significantly reduced from the proposed two storey side extension originally envisaged, is in my opinion now acceptable in terms of its scale.

The proposed extension sits no further forward than the existing addition and should not (subject to detail) have a harmful physical impact on the historic fabric of the building, which is confined to the front range, or result in concealment of additional fabric of interest from view. The removal of the side wall to the existing rear extension affects only relatively modern fabric and is not considered contentious.

In summary, therefore, the proposed extension is considered to preserve the special interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the Horsted Keynes Conservation Area.

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

Parish Council: No objection.

INTRODUCTION

The application seeks listed building consent for the demolition of the existing single storey side extension and in its place for the development of a single storey side extension.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/21/3790: Construct single storey workshop building, new driveway and entrance gate and associated landscaping works. Permission 18.03.2022.

DM/22/0961: Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 5 and 8 relating to planning reference DM/21/3790. Permission 18.10.2022.

DM/24/2144: Single storey extension and internal alterations. Demolish existing single storey. Refused 16.04.2025.

DM/24/2128: Single storey extension and internal alterations. Demolish existing single storey. (Amended Plans and Planning Statement received 13/01/2025). Refused 16.04.2025.

DM/25/2982: Proposed single storey extension and internal alterations. Demolish existing single storey. Pending consideration.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

1 Old Church Cottage is located to the eastern side of Church Lane and is a semi-detached two storey dwellinghouse attached to Spring Cottage on the eastern (side) with St Giles Primary School to the north. Both 1 Old Church Cottage and Spring Cottage are Grade II Listed Buildings, the site is designated as being within the built up area boundaries of Horsted Keynes, as well as being within the Conservation Area and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The proposed development would demolish the existing single storey side (west) elevation extension. In its place, a new single storey side extension would be developed which would measure at approximately 6m in length, 3.3m in maximum width, have an eaves height of 2.3m and a ridge height measuring at 3.9m high. Proposed external materials would comprise a brick plinth and oak cladding to the walls, plain clay roof tiles as well as a lead valley and oak joinery to the windows and doors.

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 Horsted Keynes 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.

Neighbourhood Plan

Horsted Keynes Neighbourhood Plan (Made May 2023)

Relevant Policies

Policy HK6 Conserving Local Heritage

Other Legislation

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Section 16(2) - 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.

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) was published for public consultation on 12th January 2024 for six weeks and as a result of this consultation there are unresolved objections to the majority of Policies in the draft District Plan. 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)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 is a material consideration. Paragraphs 2, 8, 11, 39, 48, 131, 135, 139, 207, 208, 209, 212-215, 219 & 220.

ASSESSMENT

It is considered that the main issues that need to be considered in the determination of this application are as follows;

- Impact on Character and Design, Including Heritage Assets

Impact on Character and Design, Including Heritage Assets

With regard to the setting of the listed building, DP34 requires:

'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.'*

Paragraph 207 of the NPPF requires the applicant to describe the significance of any heritage asset affected. Significance is defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF as *"The value of a heritage asset to this and future generations because of its heritage interest. The interest may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic. Significance derives not only from a heritage asset's physical presence, but also from its setting."* The applicant has provided a Heritage Statement in support of the application which assesses the proposals impact on the relevant heritage assets. Therefore, this requirement of the NPPF is considered to have been met.

Paragraph 208 of the NPPF requires the Local Planning Authority to identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected and take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal.

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 212 - 215 of the NPPF states:

"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.

Policy HK6 of the Horsted Keynes Neighbourhood Plan requires development proposals to preserve or enhance the special character and setting of the Horsted Keynes Conservation Area. A number of different features are also identified within the policy for proposals to have regard to within the conservation area. This includes:

- The use of traditional and natural building materials
- The hedgerows, trees and banked verges, including those in Church Lane, Bonfire Lane and Wyatts Lane.

Principle DG49 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide states:

The below assessment is made whilst being mindful of this guidance and having regard to the statutory duty of the Council, as the Local Planning Authority, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting in accordance with the requirements of Section 16(2) and to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

The proposed development constitutes a decrease in footprint from the previously refused schemes under DM/24/2144 and DM/24/2128. As noted within the Conservation Officer's response, the proposed extension would utilise a stepped footprint which would help improve its overall subservience to the original dwelling. Furthermore, the use of the hipped roof forms are considered to reduce the overall perceived size, scale and bulk of the proposal.

The extension is considered to likely be read as a later addition to the property due to its use of an alternative wall material through oak cladding. Further information and details regarding the proposed facing materials can be secured through a pre-commencement condition which has been agreed with the Applicant. These conditions are considered relevant and necessary in the instance that listed building consent is granted.

Internally, part of the existing side (western) elevation wall to the existing kitchen room would be removed in order to allow for an open plan layout between the kitchen space and proposed dining room. No objection was raised by the Council's Conservation Officer in relation to this aspect and noted that this aspect related to a more modern 20th century addition. As such, this alteration is considered to be acceptable.

In light of the above, the proposal is considered to preserve the special interest of the listed building and would result in a neutral impact on the Horsted Keynes Conservation Area. The proposal would comply with the provisions of Policy and DP34 of the District Plan, Policy HK6 of the Horsted Keynes Neighbourhood Plan and the statutory duties as set out within the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

To summarise, it is considered that the proposal result in a neutral impact on the Horsted Keynes Conservation Area and will have an acceptable impact on the listed building. As such, the application complies with Policy DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policy HK6 of the Horsted Keynes Neighbourhood Plan, the Mid Sussex Design Guide, Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) act and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Stefan Galyas