

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/2587	Case Officer:	Andrew Horrell
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Erection of oak framed side and rear extensions		
Site:	Chatesgrove, Cross Colwood Lane, Bolney, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5RY, ,		
Validation Date	16 Oct 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	21 Nov 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Refusal	Recommendation Date:	22 Dec 2025
Target Date:	11 Dec 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	Andrew Horrell

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	23 Dec 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/2587

**Chatesgrove, Cross Colwood Lane, Bolney, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH17 5RY,
Erection of oak framed side and rear extensions
Mr Jack Nethercott**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

MSDC Flood Risk and Drainage:

We have no objection to the proposed development on flood risk grounds. This is subject to the proposed development incorporating all flood mitigation and resilience measures set out within the Flood Risk Assessment (dated 16th October 2025), including finished floor levels.

Drainage should be managed via Building Regulations and Building Control, as necessary.

MSDC Conservation Officer:

Although the extensions are single storey, they are over a significantly enlarged footprint in comparison with the previous approval and are considerably greater in overall bulk. In my opinion, this results in an unacceptable relationship of scale between the historic core of the building and the additions to it, particularly bearing in mind the cumulative impact of these extensions with the existing very substantial early 20th century wing.

This adverse impact is exacerbated by the depth of the projection of the additions to the rear (west) side of the building, in that they project beyond the historic rear building line of the house. This increases the undue visual prominence of the extensions in relation to the 17th century house.

Furthermore, the current proposal in the manner in which the orangery extension abuts and extends beyond the north elevation of the historic core, and wraps around to attach to its western elevation, blurs the differentiation between the 17th century house and the 20th century extension, and has an adverse impact on the manner in which the surviving historic fabric of the elevations concerned can be seen and appreciated. A potential for damage to the fabric from the attachment of the extension would also be present.

The roof forms of both elements are not sympathetic to the context. The gables to the northern elevation, although intended to mimic the existing gables to the house, are greater in scale and therefore exacerbate the undue visual prominence of this elevation. The long, gabled roof form also appears awkward juxtaposed with the hipped roof of the existing house. It should be noted that this existing roof is 20th century, not 17th century in date (as suggested in the submitted heritage statement) and thus the existing permission did not result in any direct impact on the more historic fabric of the house. The extensive flat roof proposed to the rear is also not a sympathetic response to the existing roof forms of the house.

Aspects of the detailing, including the fenestration, to both elements are also considered unsympathetic to the context.

For these reasons, I consider that the proposal detracts from the special interest of the listed building, contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34. In terms of the NPPF, I would place the harm as less than substantial, at the mid-high range of that scale, such that the balancing exercise set out in

paragraph 215 will apply. I would also consider the proposal contrary to the requirements of the Council's adopted Design Guide, specifically Design Principles DG49, DG50 and DG51.

Southern Water:

No objections

PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No objection subject to the support of the Conservation Officer

INTRODUCTION

Planning permission is sought to for the erection of oak framed side and rear extensions

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/17/4850 - Proposed part one storey and part two storey extension to North side of existing house including internal and external alterations. Extension over existing garden store by addition of first floor, to create guest house. Works to landscape & driveway. (withdrawn)

DM/18/3232 - Proposed part one storey and part two storey extension to existing house including internal and external alterations. New cellar below proposed extension to north. New dormer window to east elevation. Demolition of existing garden store and replacement with a single storey guest lodge (ancillary accommodation to main dwelling). Works to landscape and driveway, including replacement gates and re-configured entrance. (approved)

DM/20/3141 - Internal alterations to existing house including to fenestration. Demolition of existing garden store and replacement single storey guest lodge (ancillary accommodation to main dwelling). Erection of poolhouse. Works to landscape and driveway, including replacement gates and re-configured entrance. (approved)

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Chatesgrove is a Grade II listed building dating originally from the early 17th century, with later alterations. It is situated in substantial grounds in rural position outside the village of Bolney.

It is a two storey detached hipped roofed dwelling with pitched gables to front and rear. The walls are a mix of timber and Horsham stone, timber doors and windows. It is characterised by an existing side porch and rear porch.

To the north-east of the site are outbuildings with a pool to set higher, with woodland beyond, to the south-east of the site is the sloped driveway to a parking area and equestrian facilities beyond, to the south-west of the site is hedging and woodland to highway beyond and to the north-west is the rear garden with woodland to The Yards beyond.

The site is situated within the countryside and the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (HWAONB) as defined in the District and Neighbourhood Plans.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The existing side utility lean-to is to be removed which measures approximately 2.75m in depth, 2m in width with a height to eaves of 2.25m and an overall height of 3.2m.

The proposed side/rear side extension approximately measures 13.36m in maximum depth, 15.51m in maximum width. The pitched roofed side kitchen/dining room has an approximate height to eaves of 2.35m and an overall height of 5.65m. The flat roofed lounge/garden room has a flat roofed height of 2.773m with the roof lantern adding approximately 0.7m in height.

Internal works include the dining room changed to a snug, the kitchen changed to a utility room with a door to the opened-up entrance hall/boot room to replace the existing hall and breakfast room.

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 Bolney 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
DP16 - Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
DP26 - Character and Design
DP34 - Listed buildings and other heritage assets
DP41 - Flood Risk and Drainage

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 Bolney Neighbourhood Plan was 'made' in September 2016. It forms part of the development plan with full weight.

Relevant policy:

BOLE2 Protect and Enhance the Countryside
BOLD1 Design of New Development and Conservation

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 the stage 1 hearings were concluded on the 31st 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:

DPS4 - Flood Risk and Drainage
DPC1 - Protection and Enhancement of the Countryside
DPC4 - High Weald of Outstanding Natural Beauty

DPB1 - Character and Design
DPB2 - Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets

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.

The High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan 2024-2029

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (December 2024)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 is a material consideration. Paragraphs 8, 11, 131, 135, 189, 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.'*

BOLE2 of the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan has a similar ethos and states:

'Outside the Built-up Area Boundary, development must demonstrate that it does not have an unacceptable impact on the landscape. In particular, development proposals must demonstrate how they have addressed the requirements of BOLD1 of the Neighbourhood Plan'.

Given the domestic nature of the proposal, it is deemed in character with the rural location. The proposal therefore complies with DP12 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, BOLE2 of the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

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'

At neighbourhood plan level, policy BOLD 1 states in part that:

'Planning permission for new development will ordinarily be permitted subject to the following criteria: It is designed to a high quality which reflects Bolney's rural nature and responds to the heritage and distinctive character by way of; height, scale, spacing, layout, orientation, design and materials of buildings, and the scale, design and materials of the public realm (highways, footways, open space and landscape); and It does not have an unacceptable impact on the setting of any heritage asset; and It respects the natural contours of a site and protects and sensitively incorporates well-established natural features of the landscape including trees, species -rich hedgerows and ponds within the site; and It will not result in unacceptable levels of light, noise, air or water 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 Design Guide also contains Principle DG51 which specifically relates to rear extensions, and states:

'rear extensions which are not visible from the street and do not negatively impact on neighbouring properties can be expressed in many forms, including by adopting a contemporary architectural approach. With reference to DG49, they should nevertheless have consideration for the character of the existing building and the relationship of the extension with the side boundaries and adjacent buildings and gardens.'

The proposed extensions while subordinate in height and set back from the front elevation the wraparound nature of the proposal is not considered to be of an appropriate design, size and scale that is in-keeping with the existing dwellinghouse. It will overwhelm the size of the original dwellinghouse and will blur the differentiation between the 17th century house and the 20th century extension.

The proposal thereby conflicts with Policy DP26 of the District Plan and principle DG49 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide.

Impact on the High Weald AONB

The site is located within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The legal framework for AONBs (also known as National Landscapes) in England and Wales is provided by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (CRoW Act) which at Section 82 reaffirms the primary purpose of AONBs: to conserve and enhance natural beauty. Section 84 of the CRoW Act requires Local Planning Authorities to *'take all such action as appears to them expedient for accomplishment of the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB'*. The Levelling-up and Regeneration Act (2023) amended Section 85 of the CRoW Act, to create a new duty on relevant authorities to *'seek to further the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area when discharging their functions in AONBs'*. A similar ethos is found within The High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan which is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications in the AONB.

Policy DP16 of the Mid Sussex District Plan states:

'Development within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), as shown on the Policies Maps, will only be permitted where it conserves or enhances natural beauty and has regard to the High Weald AONB Management Plan, in particular:

- *the identified landscape features or components of natural beauty and to their setting;*
- *the traditional interaction of people with nature, and appropriate land management;*
- *character and local distinctiveness, settlement pattern, sense of place and setting of the AONB;*
- and
- *the conservation of wildlife and cultural heritage.*

Small scale proposals which support the economy and social well-being of the AONB that are compatible with the conservation and enhancement of natural beauty will be supported.

Development on land that contributes to the setting of the AONB will only be permitted where it does not detract from the visual qualities and essential characteristics of the AONB, and in particular should not adversely affect the views into and out of the AONB by virtue of its location or design.'

Paragraph 189 of the NPPF states that:

'Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also

important considerations in these areas, and should be given great weight in National Parks and the Broads. The scale and extent of development within these designated areas should be limited, while development within their setting should be sensitively located and designed to avoid or minimize adverse impacts on the designated areas.'

Given the domestic nature of the proposal, it is not deemed to detract from the character of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Beauty. Therefore, the proposal is deemed to comply with DP16 of the Mid Sussex District Plan paragraph 189 of the NPPF.

Impact to the Listed Building and its setting

Chatesgrove is a Grade II listed building dating originally from the early 17th century, with later alterations. It is situated in substantial grounds in rural position outside the village of Bolney.

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 proposed single storey extensions are a significant enlargement in footprint and bulk from the previous approvals at the property. As outlined above it is felt that proposal would create an unacceptable relationship of scale between the historic core of the building and the additions to it, particularly bearing in mind the cumulative impact of these proposed extensions with the existing very substantial early 20th century wing. The current proposal, in the manner in which the orangery extension abuts and extends beyond the north elevation of the historic core, and wraps around to attach to its western elevation, blurs the differentiation between the 17th century house and the 20th century extension

Therefore, the proposal is seen to detract from the special interest of the listed building, contrary to the requirements of District Plan Policy DP34. In terms of the NPPF, the Conservation Officer placed the harm as less than substantial, at the mid-high range of that scale, such that the balancing exercise set out in paragraph 215 will apply.

In terms of the NPPF the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the heritage assets, as set out in paragraph 215, and is weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The proposal relates to the enlargement of the existing residential property, and no specific public benefit for the proposal has been put forward. It is therefore considered that the proposal would not result in any public benefit (of a private domestic extension) that would outweigh this harm.

Therefore, the proposal is seen as contrary to DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

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.

There are a number of residential properties situated along Cross Colwood Lane. However, due to the distances between neighbouring dwellings and the dense boundary screening, it is considered that the proposals will not result in significant detriment to the amenities of the nearby residential properties through a loss of privacy or noise and disturbance.

The proposal is thereby in terms of neighbouring amenities is considered to comply with policy DP26 of the District Plan.

Flood Risk and Drainage

Policy DP41 seeks to ensure that development is satisfactorily drained and does not cause a risk of flooding off site.

The Council's Drainage Engineer has commented on the proposal is deemed acceptable.

The Planning Officer has no reason to disagree with the comments of the Drainage Engineer and therefore the proposal is considered to comply with policy DP41 of the District Plan in respect of flood risk and drainage.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

Planning legislation requires the application to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It is therefore necessary for the planning application to be assessed against the policies in the development plan and then to take account of other material planning considerations including the NPPF.

The proposal is deemed acceptable in terms of the rural location, the High Weald AONB, neighbouring amenities and flood risk.

However, the proposed side and rear extension by virtue of its design, scale and appearance would be out of keeping with the character of the dwelling

Furthermore, it is not considered that an extension to a residential dwelling would provide any public benefits that would outweigh the identified harm to the Listed Building.

The proposal therefore would conflict with policies DP26, DP34 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, policies BOLD1 of the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan, Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, design principles DG49 of the Mid Sussex Design Guide and the relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Decision: Refusal

Case Officer: Andrew Horrell