

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/0694	Case Officer:	Emily Wade
Application Type:	Householder Application		
Proposal:	Reduce projection of the front of the garage by 60cm to position existing wooden double doors to garage level with front of house (their original position), resurface poor condition concrete driveway with tarmac, apply thin layer of resin bond over concrete inside passage to match driveway. Repaint front door.		
Site:	The Holt, 78 High Street, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2HP,		
Validation Date	28 Mar 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	2 May 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	20 May 2025
Target Date:	23 May 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	Emily Wade

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	20 May 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/0694

**The Holt, 78 High Street, Lindfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 2HP,
Reduce projection of the front of the garage by 60cm to position existing wooden double doors to garage level with front of house (their original position), resurface poor condition concrete driveway with tarmac, apply thin layer of resin bond over concrete inside passage to match driveway. Repaint front door.**

Kate Heseltine Brown

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

Not relevant.

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No objection.

INTRODUCTION

The Holt is an unlisted attached house located in a prominent position on Lindfield High Street, within the Conservation Area. The current proposal is for an alteration to the front of the building, to remove the existing projecting garage roof in favour of a flush garage frontage.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

None relevant.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The Holt is an unlisted attached house located in a prominent position on Lindfield High Street, within the Conservation Area. The attached building to the north is an early 19th century Grade II listed cottage (Rosemary Cottage); the adjacent building to the south, Crosskeys, dates from the late 16th century and is also Grade II listed. The site would be considered to be within the settings of these listed buildings.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The current proposal is for an alteration to the front of the building, to remove the existing projecting garage roof in favour of a flush garage frontage. The existing garage doors will be retained and reused.

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 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.

DP35 Conservation Areas

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 Neighbourhood Plan was made on 23rd March 2016.

There are no relevant policies.

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 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:

DPB2 Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets

DPB3 Conservation Areas

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 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 states:

'In considering whether to grant planning permission [F1 or permission in principle] 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.'

Section 72 of the same Act states that in the exercise of planning functions, LPAs shall ensure that:

'special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area'

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:...

- *Special regard is given to protecting the setting of a listed building'*

District Plan Policy DP35 will also be relevant. This states that:

' Development in a conservation area will be required to conserve or enhance its special character, appearance and the range of activities which contribute to it...']

The current proposal is for an alteration to the front of the building, to remove the existing projecting garage roof in favour of a flush garage frontage. The appearance of the garage doors will be as existing.

Whilst the date of the existing garage roof projection is of uncertain date, it is not a positive feature of the building, and its removal is not considered contentious. Indeed, this should result in an improvement to the house's façade. The proposal to retain and re-use the existing timber garage doors but in the revised position flush with the facade is not considered contentious, subject to detail.

For these reasons the proposal is not considered contentious. It should preserve settings of the adjacent listed buildings, and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, meeting the requirements of District Plan Policies DP34 and DP35 and the relevant paragraphs of the NPPF.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

It is recommended that planning permission is granted.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Emily Wade