

Delegated Decision

Sign off Sheet

Ref. No:	DM/25/0915	Case Officer:	Emily Wade
Application Type:	Listed Building Consent		
Proposal:	Internal alterations to include structural alterations to kitchen, new doors and rooflights, new partitions and alterations to the layout at ground and second floors, and external landscaping.		
Site:	Tanyard Manor, Horsted Lane, Sharpthorne, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 4HY, ,		
Validation Date	2 Apr 2025	Overall Expiry Date:	14 May 2025
Pre-Commencement Conditions Required:		Pre-Com Conditions Date Agreed:	
Recommendation:	Permission	Recommendation Date:	1 Aug 2025
Target Date:	28 May 2025	Recommending Officer Signature:	Emily Wade

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

Signed and Agreed By:	Stephen Ashdown	Date:	1 Aug 2025
Comments:			

MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

DM/25/0915

**Tanyard Manor, Horsted Lane, Sharpthorne, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 4HY,
Internal alterations to include structural alterations to kitchen, new doors and rooflights, new
partitions and alterations to the layout at ground and second floors, and external landscaping.
Mr And Mrs R Hagan**

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS

None received.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTEES

N/A

TOWN/PARISH COUNCIL OBSERVATIONS

No response to date.

INTRODUCTION

The current proposal is for internal and external works to Tanyard Manor, a Grade II listed building, including alterations to the plan form at ground, first and second floors, removal of a built in sauna at first floor with reinstatement of the overlying fabric, works to the basement including removal of asbestos and introduction of waterproofing membrane, and external works including alterations to the fenestration to the 20th century wing, and replacement of existing hard surfacing to paths and terraces around the building.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

DM/25/1753 and 1754 Planning and listed building consent applications under consideration for removal of above ground oil tank and replacement with below ground LPG tank, replacement of cess pit with new below ground water treatment plant, replacement retaining wall and steps.

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Tanyard Manor is a Grade II listed building situated in a rural position to the south of Sharpthorne. It is set in extensive gardens, with outbuildings to the north west.

APPLICATION DETAILS

The current proposal is for internal and external works to Tanyard Manor, a Grade II listed building, including alterations to the plan form at ground, first and second floors, removal of a built in sauna at first floor with reinstatement of the overlying fabric, creation of a laundry room at the same floor, installation of a bathroom at second floor, works to the basement including removal of asbestos and introduction of waterproof membranes, and external works including alterations to the fenestration to the 20th century wing, and replacement of existing hard surfacing to paths and terraces around the building.

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 West Hoathly 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

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

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, in part, 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 has been amended following discussion, is for internal and external works comprising alterations to the plan form at ground, first and second floors, removal of a built in sauna at first floor with reinstatement of the overlying fabric, creation of a bathroom at second floor, works to the basement including removal of asbestos and introduction of waterproof membrane, and external works including alterations to the fenestration to the 20th century wing, and replacement of existing hard surfacing to paths and terraces around the building.

At basement level significant alterations have previously taken place in connection with the use of the area as a plant room. It would appear that any historic finishes or surfaces have been largely lost as a result. In these circumstances, the proposed works which include removal of asbestos and waterproofing membranes to the walls and floor (the walls having previously been tanked, but this having failed) are not considered contentious.

At ground floor, the proposed works are largely confined to the 20th century wing to the north western corner of the building. The alterations here do not affect historic fabric or plan form and are not considered contentious, subject to further detail of the relationship between the proposed steel spanning the revised kitchen space and the north wall of the 17th century wing of the building, which it is suggested should be required by condition.

At first floor, the removal of a modern sauna which has been introduced within a room within the 17th century part of the building is welcomed. The proposal includes details of the reinstatement of the fabric to the overlying second floor structure which was removed with the sauna's installation. The proposed laundry room and associated works affect the 20th century wing and are not considered contentious.

At second floor, within the 17th century wing it is proposed to re-order an existing modern partition to create a bathroom and dressing room. Given the existing modern partitioning, this work is not considered contentious. Details of the proposed bathroom installation including the location of the fixtures and fittings and of the proposed floating floor and pipe runs have been provided to demonstrate that historic fabric will not be obscured or damaged by the works. This aspect of the proposal is not considered contentious.

Externally, alterations to the fenestration to the 20th century wing, and to the paving around the house are proposed. Subject to details of the new windows, which it is proposed should be reserved by condition, this aspect of the proposal is not considered contentious.

Other external works, which required further information or revision (and planning permission) have been removed from this scheme and now form part of the separate planning and listed building consent applications mentioned above.

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.

PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

It is recommended that listed building consent is granted.

Decision: Permission

Case Officer: Emily Wade